

Teachers' and Students' Attitudes and Reasons
toward Code-Switching in the Private Jordanian
Secondary English Language Classes.

اتجاهات ودوافع المدرسين والطلبة حول التحول اللغوي في
الانجليزية في المدارس الثانوية الاردنية الخاصة

Prepared by
Mariam Issa Al-Naimat

Supervised by
Prof. Bader Dweik

M.A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirement for Master of Arts in English Language and
Literature

Middle East University for Graduate Studies

Faculty of Arts

Department of English Language and Literature
December, 2009

Authorization

I, *Mariam Essa Niamat*, authorize Middle East University for Graduate Studies to provide libraries, organizations and even individuals with copies of my thesis when required.

Name: Mariam Issa Al-Naimat.

Signature:

Date:

Thesis Committee Decision

This thesis "Teachers' and Students' Attitudes and Reasons toward Code-Switching in the Private Jordanian Secondary English Language Classes" was discussed and certified on the 28th of December, 2009.

Thesis Committee:

Signature

Dr. Ahmad Al-Hassan

Prof. Bader Dweik

Prof. Rasoul Khafaji

Dr. Atef Jalabneh

Acknowledgements

I feel indebted to Allah the Almighty whose blessings overwhelm me, and are increasing day after day. I owe thanks to many people for their help, advice, wisdom, and support through each step of this work.

I am sincerely grateful to my supervisor Professor Bader Dweik, who guided me along the whole journey. He was a role model of a real educator, not only through his profound insight and expertise, but also through his honorable commitment throughout the process.

I am indebted to Professor Adnan Al-Jadiri, Professor Awatef Sheer, Professor Riyad Hussein, Professor Rasoul Khafaji, Doctor Ghazi Khalifeh and Doctor Zaid Al-Shamaila for their help and support.

My appreciation also goes to the participants in my study. I greatly appreciate the assistance of the teachers and students who welcomed me into their classrooms.

Finally yet importantly, I would like to extend my gratitude and appreciation to my family for their love, support and patience, to my mother best friend Entesar Al-rabadi. Also, to my brothers, Mohammad, Mahmoud, Ahmad and Khaled, for their continuous love and encouragement throughout the years.

Dedication

To my beloved mother

Table of Contents

	Subjects	Page
	Thesis Title	I
	Authorization	II
	Thesis Committee Decision	III
	Acknowledgement	IV
	Dedication	V
	Tables of Contents	VI
	List of Tables	VIII
	List of Appendices	IX
	Abstract - English	X
	Abstract - Arabic	XIII
Chapter One	Introduction	
1.0	Background of the Study	1-5
1.1	Statement of the Problem	5
1.2	Objectives of the Study	5
1.3	Questions of the Study	6
1.4	Significance of the Study	6
1.5	Limitations of the Study	6
1.6	Definitions of the Terms	7
Chapter Two	Review of Related Literature	
2.0	Introduction	8
2.1	Review of Theoretical Literature	8
2.1.1	Definitions of Code Switching	8-9
2.1.2	Attitudes toward Code Switching	10
2.1.2.1	Positive Attitudes toward Code Switching	10-15
2.1.2.2	Negative Attitudes toward Code Switching	15-16
2.1.3	Empirical Studies	17
2.1.3.1	Empirical Studies in Jordan	17-18
2.1.3.2	Empirical Studies Worldwide	18-29
Chapter Three	Methods and Procedures	
3.0	Introduction	30
3.1	Population and Sample of the Study	30
3.1.1	Selection of the Subjects	31-33
3.2	Instruments	33-34
3.2.1	Observation	34
3.2.1.1	Validity of the Classroom Observation Checklist	34

3.2.1.2	Reliability of the Classroom Observation Checklist	35
3.2.2	Semi-Structured Interviews	35
3.2.2.1	Validation of Interviews Questions	36
3.3	Questionnaires	36
3.3.1	Teachers' Questionnaire	36
3.3.2	Students' Questionnaire	37
3.3.3	Validity of the Questionnaires	38
3.3.4	Reliability of the Questionnaires	38
3.4	Design of the Study	39
3.5	Research Procedures	39
Chapter four	Results of the Study	
4.0	Introduction	40
4.1	Results of Question One	40-43
4.2	Results of Question Two	43-49
4.3	Results of Question Three	49-55
4.4	Analysis of the Semi-Structured Interviews	56-59
4.5	Analysis of the Classroom Observation	59-62
Chapter Five	Discussion and Recommendations	
5.0	Introduction	63
5.1	Discussion of the Findings of Question One	63-64
5.2	Discussion of the Findings of Question Two	64-65
5.3	Discussion of the Findings of Question Three	66
5.4	Conclusions	67
5.5	Recommendations and Suggestions for Future Research	68
	References	69-74
	Appendices	75

List of Tables

Number	Title	Page
1	Teachers' Sample Showing Gender and Education	31
2	Students' Sample According to Gender.	32
3	Students' Sample According to Streams in the five Schools.	32-33
4	Percentages and Means for the Teachers' Attitudes toward CS	42-43
5	Percentages and Means for the Teachers' Reasons for Using CS	44-47
6	Percentages and Means for the Students' Attitudes toward Teachers' CS	53-55

List of Appendices

Appendix	Title	Page
Appendix A	MEU Permission Letter	73
Appendix B	Panel of Experts and Validation Letters.	74-76
Appendix C	Classroom Observation Checklist	77-78
Appendix D	Semi-Structured Interviews Questions.	79-82
Appendix E	Teachers' Questionnaire	83-87
Appendix F	Students' Questionnaire (English – Arabic)	88-95
Appendix G	Schools	96

Teachers' and Students' Attitudes and Reasons toward
Code-Switching in the Private Jordanian Secondary
English Language Classes.

By

Mariam Issa Saeed Al-Naimat

Supervisor

Professor Bader Dweik

Abstract

This study aimed at investigating Teachers' and Students' Attitudes and Reasons toward Code-Switching in the Private Jordanian Secondary English Language Classes. The study raised the following questions:

1. What are the attitudes of Jordanian EFL teachers toward CS in EFL classroom?
2. Why do Jordanian EFL teachers resort to CS in EFL classes?
3. What are the students' attitudes toward teachers' CS?

To achieve the goals of the study, the researcher used three instruments after establishing their validity and reliability and they were: classroom observation checklist, semi-structured interviews and teachers' and students' questionnaires. The first sample included 58 teachers of English and 168 students from the first secondary classes. The two samples were selected from different schools in West Amman with relation to the two questionnaires. Second, four teachers were chosen upon their cooperation to be interviewed and observed in their classrooms.

Statistical analysis was conducted for the collected data. The percentages and means were calculated for the questionnaires, and the lesson observations and interviews were described in words.

Results of the study revealed that:

Teachers became conscious of Code Switching's (CS) effect on the students language use. They were divided into positive and negative attitudes about the use of CS in EFL classes. They claimed that it helped both teachers and students by enhancing interaction in the classroom and increasing the learning/ teaching of English. But despite of this, they were sure that CS impeded the students' oral communication and should be controlled as far as possible.

Teachers' reasons for CS were varied. Some of them code switch to help students develop their communicative competence by asking

questions and giving answers; others code switch to help students to understand grammar and new vocabulary which according to students it facilitated learning English.

According to the findings of the study, the researcher recommended that the sample may be extended to include public and private schools for the purpose of detecting the differences between them.

اتجاهات ودوافع المدرسين والطلبة حول التحول اللغوي في الانجليزية في المدارس الثانوية الاردنية الخاصة

إعداد

مريم عيسى سعيد النعيمات

إشراف

الأستاذ الدكتور بدر الدويك

ملخص الدراسة

هدفت هذه الدراسة الى معرفة إتجاهات ودوافع المدرسين والطلبة حول التحول اللغوي في

الإنجليزية في المدارس الثانوية الأردنية الخاصة. و طرحت الدراسة الاسئلة التالية:

(1) ما هي إتجاهات مدرسي اللغة الانجليزية حول التحول اللغوي في صفوف اللغة

الانجليزية؟

(2) لماذا يلجأ مدرسو اللغة الانجليزية الى التحول اللغوي في صفوف اللغة الانجليزية؟

(3) ما هي إتجاهات الطلبة حول استخدام المدرسين لأسلوب التحول اللغوي؟

لمعرفة الاجوبة على هذه الاسئلة، قامت الباحثة بإستخدام الأدوات التالية بعد التأكد من صدقيتها

وثباتها: أولاً نموذج للمشاهدة الصفية،ثانياً إجراء مقابلات مع مدرسي المرحلة الثانوية، ثالثاً

استبيان للمدرسين والطلبة. شملت الدراسة ثمانية وخمسين (58) مدرساً ومدرسة للغة الانجليزية

للمرحلة الثانوية، و مائة وثمانين وستين(168) طالباً وطالبة في الصف الأول الثانوي في

المدارس الثانوية الخاصة الواقعة في منطقة عمان الغربية.

تم إجراء المقابلات مع أربع مدرسين وتمت مشاهدة ثلاث حصص صفية لكل منهم. ثم تم حساب النسب والمتوسطات للاستبانات والسرد الوصفي للمقابلات والمشاهدات، وقد بينت نتائج الاستبانات والمقابلات والمشاهدات مدى وعي المدرسين للأثر الإيجابي والسلبي لأسلوب التحول اللغوي على استخدام الطلبة للغة الانجليزية. حيث وجد البعض أنها تساعد على زيادة المشاركة من قبل الطلبة وتسريع عملية التدريس في صفوف اللغة الانجليزية. في حين أكد البعض الآخر على أن هذا الأسلوب يعرقل تطوير مهارة التحدث لدى الطلبة لذلك يجب التحكم بهذا الأسلوب قدر الإمكان. تعددت أسباب المدرسين حول لجوئهم إلى استخدام التحول اللغوي في صفوف اللغة الانجليزية. فقد أوعز البعض بأن هذا الأسلوب يساعد الطلبة على طرح الأسئلة وإعطاء الأجوبة بالإضافة أنه يسهل على الطلبة معرفة معاني الكلمات وفهم قواعد اللغة الانجليزية وهو ما اتفق عليه الطلبة من حيث أن استخدام اللغة العربية يساعدهم على تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية.

وبناء على هذه النتائج، فقد قدمت الدراسة عدداً من المقترحات والتوصيات، وأهمها : أن يتم توسيع العينة المستخدمة في هذه الدراسة وتطبيقها على المدارس بنوعها الخاصة منها، والحكومية وذلك لمعرفة معايير الاختلاف بينهما.

Chapter One

Introduction

1.0 Background of the Study

Broughton et al (1978) mentioned that out of the 4.000 to 5.000 living languages, English is by far the most widely used. As a mother tongue, it ranks second only to Chinese, which is effectively six mutually unintelligible dialects little used outside China. The number of people who uses English covers one-sixth of the world's population.

Cook (2001) claimed that in the past, English was one international language among others, it is now increasingly in a category of its own. In addition to its four hundred million or so first-language speakers, and over a billion people who live in a country where it is an official language, English is now taught as the main foreign language in almost every country and used for business, education and access to information by a substantial proportion of the world's population.

Dweik (1986) reported that in 1952 when Jordan attained its independence, the Jordanian government realized the important role of the English language and decided to include English in the educational curriculum. He also reported that the early introduction of English in

some schools justified, to a certain extent, the students' success and mastery of English.

Diab (2009) mentioned that there are already some schools that use English to teach subject studies i.e. the International School and others. The majority of Jordanian elementary school students, study English as their first foreign language at the age of six. By the time they finish their secondary school, they have been studying English for 12 years. Usually English is only one school subject among others that means that the students receive approximately the same amount of teaching in English as they do in other subjects.

In English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom in Jordan, the teacher's aim is to teach students English while the students' aim is to learn English by listening, reading and doing written and oral activities. The language of teaching is usually English. However, as Arabic is the mother tongue of both the teachers and students, it is very likely that there will be situations during the lessons of an English course where Arabic will be used instead of English and where the language changes from English to Arabic and vice versa.

The method of teaching which allows the native language to be used in class is not restricted to the grammar translation method or the code switching technique. The communicative method, which is sometimes called the notional or the functional method, also allows limited use of

the native language. The strengths of the communicative method as suggested by Naser (1980) lie in the following facts:

"(a) language is viewed as a live means of communication. (b) Language is used to communicate certain ideas or notions. (c) The purposes for which language is used are given initial and primary significance; the language forms (vocabulary, structures ...etc) that serve these purposes are selected accordingly". (p.127)

This method is very practical in the sense that students learn language elements that they can immediately experience in use. But if this method is followed without enough attention to structural matters, foreign language learners may end up learning a few things that they can use without developing the necessary language skills. Besides, teachers whose own command of the target language is not very strong may find this method very difficult to adopt and follow; they would resort to using the native language as a vehicle for teaching or adopt the code switching (CS) technique in teaching English as a foreign language. According to Sert (2005) in this technique the teacher "alternates between two languages". (P.5). This technique seems to be prevailing in some Jordanian schools and popular by some Jordanian teachers.

Scholars have different views about the code switching technique. While some encourage the use of the native language for educational purposes i.e. Piasecka (1988), Canagarajah (1995), Skiba (1997),

Schweers (1999), Cook (2001), Moore (2002), Bradley (2003), others consider it a point of weakness which does not help in achieving the goals of learning the foreign language. This issue was advocated by i.e. Valdes-Fallis (1978), Atkinson (1987), Jacobson (1990), Simon (2001). Supporters of using the code switching technique see it helpful because it motivates learners and activates their thinking. It is used for clarification and it intends to involve all students in discussion rather than focus on the few. Those who oppose it find it not useful because it impedes learners' communicative competence and enhances insecurity of expression.

It is observed that many EFL teachers in Jordan and in the world use this technique in EFL classrooms. This is confirmed by Sert (2005) who maintained that

"Alternation between languages in the form of code switching is a widely observed phenomenon in foreign language classrooms. The languages between which alternation is performed are the native language of the students, and the foreign language that students are expected to gain competence in" .p. (28)

Code switching is widely used in the teaching of English in Jordan. Dweik (1986) mentioned that some teachers present the material in Arabic owing to their weakness of English in their oral expression. Similarly, Hussein (1999) investigated Jordanian university students' attitudes toward code switching and code mixing to find out reasons

behind code switching and the maximum use of English expressions that are used in Arabic discourse. He found out that the majority of students code switch with English for a variety of reasons such as:

1. The presence of English terms with no Arabic equivalents.
2. Scientific concepts can be expressed easier in English.
3. The students' familiarity with formulaic English expressions such as (greetings, apologies, compliments, etc.)

Nawafleh (2008) also discussed the way people in Jordan communicate using different forms of languages or language dialects especially colloquial Jordanian. He looked at the process of communication as an identity defining patterns from which we can trace the cultural, ethnic, social, economic, and even religious factors.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Because this technique has supporters and opponents, the researcher decided to focus on this problem of learning/ teaching English as a foreign language. Eventually the outcome of the study might help students, teachers and others who have interest in foreign language learning/teaching.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The current study examines the reasons and attitudes of the Jordanian EFL teachers who teach 11th grade in some private secondary stage schools and examines the students' attitudes toward teachers' CS.

1.3 Questions of the Study

To achieve the above-mentioned objectives, the study will answer the following questions:

1. What are the attitudes of Jordanian EFL teachers towards CS in EFL classroom?
2. Why do Jordanian EFL teachers resort to CS in EFL classes?
3. What are the students' attitudes towards teachers' CS?

1.4 Significance of the Study

Studies focusing on Arabic-English code switching, or studies investigating English-Arabic code switching are fewer in number compared with other studies on code switching, such as Spanish-English code switching or Japanese-English code switching. Thus, this study which sets out to investigate Arabic-English and English-Arabic code switching in teaching EFL in Jordan aims to fill a gap in the literature. Results of this study may benefit teachers of English, language planners and curriculum language designers.

1.5 Limitations of the Study

Results of the study cannot be generalized to all teachers and students of EFL courses in Jordan. The study is only limited to the sample of the study, its instruments and the time of its investigation.

1.6 Definition of Terms

Code switching: CS is a technique used by some teachers of English as a foreign language in their classes through which they alternate between the native language of the students (Arabic) and the target language they teach (English).

Attitudes: are expressions of positive or negative feelings towards a language that may reflect impressions of linguistic difficulty or simplicity, ease or difficulty of learning, degree of importance, elegance, social status, etc. Attitudes towards a language may also show what people feel about the speakers of that language which eventually may have an effect on the foreign language learning.

Secondary Stage: In Jordan the secondary stage includes eleventh and twelfth grades. (General Guidelines and General and Specific Outcomes for the English Language, 2006).

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

2.0 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to review the related literature. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section deals with to theoretical literature which includes definitions of code switching (CS) by different scholars and researchers and their attitudes towards it. The second section reviews empirical studies that examine CS in different EFL classrooms and the reasons for using it.

2.1 Review of Theoretical Literature

Below, the researcher discusses the definitions of code switching and the attitudes toward it.

2.1.1 Definitions of Code Switching

Research on code switching is diverse and thus, the terminology related is also very much varied. Researchers do not seem even to agree on the very term of code switching; therefore this phenomenon can be approached from several angles and can be defined in various ways.

Di Pietro (1977) defines code-switching as the use of more than one language by communicants in the execution of speech act.

Valdes-Fallis (1978) defines code switching as the alternating use of two languages on the word, phrase, and clause or sentence level. Similarly, Poplack (1980) defines code switching as the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent.

Gumperz (1982) focuses on the functions of code switching when he defines CS as a discourse phenomenon that can generate conversational inferences; that is, language choice itself can carry meaning in addition to the content of the message. He refers to code switching as "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems".(p.66).

Auer (1984) defines CS as the locally functional use of multiple languages in an interactional episode, which places emphasis on the roles of the different codes.

Muysken's (1987) definition includes the stipulation that the linguistic varieties be perceived by their speakers to be distinct from one another, which suggests that code switching is considered significant only when speakers themselves note the differences between the languages involved.

Myers-Scotton (1988) describes code switching as "the use of two or more languages in the same conversation without a noticeable phonological assimilation from one variety to the other".p. (157).

Romaine (1995) finds that "apart from two or more alternating languages, the term code switching has also been used about different

styles within the same language, for example formal and informal speech between monolinguals, but in the field of bilingualism and multilingualism it is used to refer to the alternate uses of two languages".p.(170).

According to Skiba (1997) Code-switching is the alternation between two codes (languages and/or dialects) between people who share those particular codes. Choices about how code-switching manifests itself are determined by a number of social and linguistic factors. Code-switching can take on several forms including alteration of sentences, phrases from both languages and switching in a long narrative. In normal conversations between two bilinguals, code-switching consists of eighty-four percent single word switches, ten percent phrase switches and six percent clause switches.

2.1.2 Attitudes towards Code Switching in the EFL Classroom

Many scholars have presented different attitudes towards the code switching technique. Some of these attitudes are positive and supportive while others are negative and discouraging.

2.1.2.1 Positive Attitudes towards Code Switching

Valdes-Fallis (1978) suggests that the classroom teacher should be aware that the use or lack of use of code switching by bilingual students can very rarely suffice as an index of language strength and weakness. Indeed, it would be difficult even for a trained linguist to make

assumptions concerning the proficiency of particular speakers from the use of different code switching patterns in their two languages.

Zentella (1981) describes not the ideal and codified practices but observes patterns of behavior. She suggests that studies of CS in such settings must consider children's interlocutors since speakers' age, sex; speech style and in-group membership status can be significant in influencing code switching behavior. She suggests that teachers' language choices have a clear effect on learners' language use.

Piasecka (1988) suggests that the use of students' native language in ESL classes in Poland should be a joint decision between teachers and students. The availability of this shared linguistic resource is empowering to learners. When teachers and students share a cultural and linguistic background, there can be closer understanding and sympathy between them because teachers can better understand learners' difficulties than would someone from a different background

Jacobson (1990) describes traditional bilingual methodology in the United States which assumed that the two languages being learned would or should be kept separate, whether on the basis of speaker (having different teachers speak different languages to the learners), subject matter, time or place. Despite this traditional assumption of the separation of languages, both languages can also be used at the same time, following different patterns, or switching between the two can be random, following

no principled rules. In concurrent translation, both languages are used to present the same content, with two versions of the content typically said in succession. In one principled way of using both languages, the students native language is used to preview lesson content, while the target language is used for the bulk of the lesson, or the lesson can be in the target language while a review is conducted in the L1; in either case, the content is presented in both languages in a systematic way. Jacobson advocates a principled functional distribution of languages in content courses taught bilingually in the U.S. In this approach, teachers monitor their language use in order to ensure that language alternation achieves pedagogically sound objectives and that switches occur in response to specific linguistic, educational and social cues. The cues fall into four categories. First are classroom strategies, which include review of material, capturing students' attention and praise. Second, switches due to curricular cues help to maintain appropriate language use according to the topics and texts being discussed. Third, teachers switching in response to language development cues may be considering students' language dominance and lexical development. Finally, interpersonal relationship cues to code switching help to maintain rapport with students and establish intimate or formal tones.

Skiba (1997) suggests that in the circumstances where code switching is used due to an inability of expression, it serves for continuity in speech

instead of presenting interference in language. In this respect, code switching stands to be a supporting element in communication of information and in social interaction; therefore it serves for communicative purposes in the way that it is used as a tool for transference of meaning.

Schweers (1999) believes that in a case where the instructor is a native speaker of L2, students can better identify with them if the instructor speaks the students' L1; thus, showing that the instructor respects and values the students' mother tongue. The instructor can also be held as a model of someone who successfully learned another language.

According to Simon (2001), a typical feature of bilingual or multilingual language classroom interaction is that code switching has been thought of as a forbidden practice, or if not forbidden then to be avoided at all costs. She continues to state that teachers who have employed code switching have felt guilty of doing so because it has not been considered as good practice. She proposes that foreign language classrooms are a specific code switching context since, firstly, foreign language classrooms can be considered as a multilingual community to the effect that the participants share knowledge about the pedagogical contract which governs code choice in different pedagogical situations. Secondly, the learners have limited knowledge of the foreign language whereas the teacher knows it well; this may increase the occurrences of

code switching. Thirdly, teacher and the students have socially and institutionally predetermined roles: teacher-status is associated with the use of foreign language and learner-status is associated with the implicit obligation to use the foreign language.

Cook (2001) argues that teacher's ability to use both the mother tongue and the target language creates an authentic learning environment. Cook continues in arguing that CS is a natural phenomenon in a setting where the speakers share two languages; so, the teachers should not discourage it in the classroom. He proposes positive ways of using the mother tongue in the classroom. First of all, teachers can use it positively in conveying meaning of words or sentences, explaining grammar and organizing the classroom. Secondly, students can use the mother tongue as part of the learning activity (translation) and in classroom activities (e.g. explain the task to classmates in the mother tongue). He asserts that CS technique can be an extremely useful way of employing the students' L1 to emphasize important concepts, re-acquire the students' attention when they become distracted, and to praise and reprimand as required. Also, he finds that the use of L1 in classroom can be gradually phased out as students become more proficient in the L2. Code switching can also involve using the L1 to supply vocabulary items, which the students are unfamiliar with, and then gradually remove them as the students progress.

Moore (2002) concludes that CS can help bridge the gap in the discourse. It can set off negotiated lateral sequences about content and/ or form. It can generate interactional changes that may potentially entail acquisitional dimensions. In situations, when the focus is not only on the development of linguistic skills but also on the transmission of subject contents, switches can add significantly to the enrichment of new concepts and become an active part in the learning experience. Such switches are qualitatively different from the other types mentioned in their ability to carry out transformations upon objects of knowledge.

Castellottis and Moore (2002) propose that CS can be an effective teaching strategy; however, they encourage the teachers to make a conscious decision about when to speak the mother tongue in the classroom because code switching can only be beneficiary to the students if it is used deliberately.

Bradley (2003) suggests that permitting the use of some words from the student's first language may keep the class moving forward, by allowing the students to express themselves, while making the class more fun and helping them to anchor new L2 vocabulary to L1 concepts.

2.1.2.2 Negative Attitudes toward Code Switching

Atkinson (1987) warns that excessive use of code switching for translation or dependency on L1 is likely to result in that the teacher and/or students begin to feel that they have not really made a clear or

understood any item of language until it has been translated. The teacher and/or the students fail to observe the distinctions between equivalence of form, semantic equivalence, and pragmatic features, and thus oversimplify to the point of using crude and inaccurate translation.

Turnbull (2001) examines when and how much the TL should be used in second language and foreign language teaching and why. He agrees with the view that second and foreign language teachers should maximize their use of the TL, and argues that doing so benefits students' TL proficiency. He argues that maximizing the TL in the classroom is a favorable practice since teachers are often the primary source of linguistic input in the TL. He believes there is no need to license teachers to use the L1; many do so in any case. He believes that official guidelines that promote the use of the TL create positive pressures for teachers, encouraging them to speak as much TL as possible.

Again Cook (2002) (as cited in Sert, 2005) warned that if code switching were applied in classes which do not share the same native language it may create problems, as some of the students (though few in number) will somehow be neglected. So, at this point it may be suggested that the students should share the same native language if code switching will be applied in instruction. Another point he considers is that the competence of the teacher in the mother tongue of the students also plays a vital role if positive contributions of code switching are expected.

2.1.3 Empirical Studies

Obviously, many researchers in Jordan and the world at large were interested in the field of CS and they conducted a number of studies each of which had a purpose, and was based on collecting data by using suitable instruments, and reached reasonable findings.

2.1.3.1 Empirical Studies in Jordan

Dweik (1986) conducted a study that aimed at focusing on the problems that secondary Jordanian students encounter. He chose a sample of 120 students from three schools in Hebron, Jerusalem and El-Karak to answer the questionnaire. The results indicated that the methods of teaching English in Jordan at that time were partially responsible for the problem. Dweik concluded that a reform in teaching English in Jordan should take place, and that it should include the teachers' qualification, the students' motivation, the curriculum design and the teaching methods.

Hussein (1999) investigated Jordanian university students' attitudes toward code-switching (CS), and code-mixing (CM) to find out when and why they code-switch and the most frequent English expressions that they use in Arabic discourse. The questionnaire he used showed that the students had negative as well as positive attitudes toward CS/CM with English in Arabic discourse. The results indicated that students used

CS/CM with English for a variety of reasons. The most important of which was the lack of Arabic equivalents for English terms or expressions. Finally, there was a frequent use of many English expressions, which varied in range and scope in the speech of Arab educated speakers.

Nawafleh (2008) discussed the way people in Jordanian community communicate by using different forms of languages or language dialects especially colloquial Jordanian. He also looked at the process of communication as an identity defining patterns from which they can trace the cultural, ethnic, social, economic, and even religious factors. He suggested that one day the birth of a new pidgin where Arabic is totally mixed with English in Jordan made the process of communication become easier and it is good to live in a bilingual society where people are able to speak more than one language especially for causes such as learning, politics, business, trade,...etc.

2.1.3.2. Empirical Studies Worldwide

Many studies dealt with CS conducted in the classroom in different regions in the world. These studies are grouped in the following:

Guthrie's (1984) (as cited in Martin-Jones, 1995) made a comparative study of two teachers, one bilingual and one monolingual. He was working with Chinese learners of English in the U.S. He found that the

bilingual teacher in his study was very consistent in her use of the mother tongue and the target language. Focusing on the bilingual teacher's switches to Chinese, he identified four communicative functions: (a) for translation; (b) for giving procedures and directions; (c) for clarification especially with the introduction of new vocabulary words; and (d) as a check for understanding.

In his study of German learners of English in a bilingual German school, Butzkamm (1988) found the students' native language to be what he called a conversational lubricant. In the class he observed, German was not used for social purposes but for educational ones as students switched from German to English principally to ask for the vocabulary they needed in order to participate in a class discussion. The students' L1 was used only as a bilingual dictionary and made teaching more efficient as students could easily learn the words they needed to express themselves. Butzkamm suggested that teachers consider students' native language a natural shortcut to learning that should be utilized where appropriate instead of avoiding code switching in class entirely.

Polio and Duff (1994) examined recordings of the foreign language classes in order to determine the functions for which English was used in each of the classes. Because of the expense of transcription and translation of the recordings, only six hours of data from the original study were examined in the follow-up study one each from instructors of

six different languages. The researchers identified eight categories of English use in the classroom: administrative vocabulary, grammar instruction, classroom management, indexing solidarity, English for practice by the teacher, providing translation of unknown target language vocabulary, remedying apparent lack of student comprehension and interaction effect involving students' use of English (that is, teachers switched to English in response to students' use of English). In interviews, instructors gave reasons for their use of English for certain functions; the main ones cited are learners' lack of requisite vocabulary and the complexity and importance of content. They criticized some reasons for using the L1 in class, suggesting that time would be better spent speaking the target language, and they provide suggestions for avoiding unnecessary use of the students' L1. While they admit that, it is difficult to make generalizations about all instructors based on these six hours of data; their results shed some light on teachers' actual use of students' native language in these FL classes.

Canagarajah (1995) described the languages used in classrooms in Jaffna for various micro-functions such as giving directions, managing discipline, giving commands, reviewing content and requesting help. He determined that English, the L2 was used primarily for interaction strictly related to the textbook and the lesson, but Tamil, the L1, was used for all other interactions; for example, those that were personal or unofficial in

nature. He suggested that language mixing in the classroom allows students the opportunity to learn the values behind each code and to discover how to negotiate identities through code switching, important lessons in a larger multilingual society that must grapple with exactly these issues. Canagarajah (1995) studied the function of code switching in ESL classrooms in Jaffna, Sri Lanka. He found out that there was a clear division of use between the two available languages. English (L2) was clearly the pedagogical formal and official language used. However, Tamil (L1) was the more affective, personal and informal language. The functions of code switching were to some extent related to this division.

The functions that Canagarajah found can be divided into two categories according to whether they were related to classroom management or content transmission. As for classroom management, the division between the formal and informal languages in classrooms was very clear. Tamil was used to prepare the class for the lesson and there was a switch to English when the lesson proper started. Similarly, Tamil was used for pre-instructional directions and English for the actual routine directions of activities. The switching also had a clear role in managing discipline complimenting and encouraging learners. The teacher separated the disciplinary comments from the actual lesson contents by a switch to Tamil. Also, when learners were not responding to directives in English the teacher repeated them in Tamil. When

expressing feelings or personal thoughts, the L1 was used. Thus, Canagarajah found out that not only switching to L1 was stronger and more affective to the cases of disciplining and encouraging, but also it was more affective to the teacher. In relation to content transmission, English was the established code for direct routine instructions. Code switches were common in the cases of repetition, reformulation, clarification, qualification and exemplification. These all served the purpose of explaining something in more detail and Canagarajah pointed out that in these cases both languages complemented each other so that learners could achieve a better understanding of the lesson content. He concluded that English was used for interaction as demanded by the textbook or the lesson and Tamil (L1) usually for other interactive purposes.

Adendorff's (1996) study of South African high schools found CS to be a communicative resource that enabled teachers and students to accomplish both educational and social objectives. In this setting, English was the official language of instruction, but the teacher used the students' and the teachers' native language, Zulu, to fulfill several social functions such as expressing encouragement and marking solidarity with students. Zulu was also used to manage the classroom. Adendorff suggested that teachers use code switching to express solidarity, power and distance. He suggested the need for teacher training and conscious-raising in order to

encourage teachers to see multilingualism as a communicative resource rather than a curse and to sensitize teachers to the notion that language choice is not neutral but has important symbolic associations.

Nizegorodcew (1996) described some functions related to teachers and learners shared L1 in Polish classes of English as a foreign language. She underscored the need to look beyond lexical gaps as an explanation for classroom code switching since teachers do alternate between languages but clearly could express themselves in one language.

She suggested that the use of the shared L1 relinquishes some power from teacher and makes interaction less formal; the tendency to use the L1 was observed particularly among teachers who perceived difficulty among their students. Nizegorodcew suggested that the L1 not to be completely avoided in the classroom because it provides a sense of security and comfort to learners: “There always remain situations in which it is more appropriate to address an interlocutor sharing the same mother tongue in that language” (p. 213).

Ogaine (1997) studied the functions and contexts of code switching among Japanese learners of English as a second language in Canada. She considered switches from English to Japanese according to such categories as tags, interjections, fixed expressions, nouns, conjunctions, adjectives, adverbs, phrases and sentences. She found that various categories of switches were associated with different functions. For

example, tag-switches and conjunctions were used to gain thinking time that is speakers' code switched to their native language for these words and phrases in order to stall while they planned the rest of their utterance in their second language. These students tended to use Japanese for such items as interjections, adjectives and adverbs in order to express their feelings and their solidarity with their classmates. Ogaine suggested that the students' goal in the class was not merely to learn English but to get along with each other while using Japanese, which helped them to accomplish this interpersonal goal. She stressed the importance of including bi- and multilingual models in discussions of foreign language competence and performance since students are learning to be bilingual and not to be monolingual.

Antón and DiCamilla (1998) suggested that learners' code switching could serve not only lexical needs but also socio-cognitive ones. The researchers conducted qualitative analyses of students' interaction during pair work and determined that learners' L1 serves significant inter- and interpsychologically needs. Interpsychologically, the L1 helped learners to communicate with each other and to help provide scaffolding for one another. That is, learners used their shared native language in order to accomplish tasks together with each learner contributing his or her own grammatical and lexical knowledge to the production of a written text. The native language also helped students to organize the accomplishment

of the task with learners using their native language to share strategies, to decide how to solve problems and to retain their focus on the task. Inter-psychologically, the L1 was the medium for personal speech that is self-directed speech that the learners used while thinking through the cognitively complex task. For the learners studied, native language served both cognitive and social needs.

Mattson & Burenhult (1999) set out their study from a series of video recordings which are supplemented by back-up audio recordings of classroom interaction between teachers and Swedish students who learn French as a second language. They concluded the following reasons:

(a) Linguistic insecurity: Since the task of the teacher is to transmit knowledge of a foreign language onto the students, it is not appropriate to use words for which the teacher will have to switch code to be able to control. This might damage the students' confidence in the teacher's proficiency of the foreign language. A possible solution for the teacher might, therefore, be to avoid words s/he does not control or quite simply restructure the utterance.

(b) Topic switch: when the teacher switches a code according to which a topic is under discussion, it might be suggested, for instance, that certain aspects of foreign language teaching such as grammar instruction are preferably expressed in the mother tongue of the students. In these cases, the students' attention is directed to the new knowledge by making

use of code switching and accordingly they make use of the native tongue. At this point it may be suggested that a bridge from known (native language) to unknown (new foreign language content) is constructed in order to transfer the new content and meaning is made clear in this way.

(c) Affective functions: they serve for expression of emotions. Code switching is used by the teacher in order to build solidarity and intimate relations with the students. In this sense, one may speak of the contribution of code switching for creating a supportive language environment in the classroom. This is not always a conscious process on part of the teacher.

(d) Socializing functions: when teachers turn to the students' first language to signal friendship and solidarity, the teacher greets /welcomes the students arrive.

(e) Repetitive functions: when teachers convey the same message in both languages for clarity, the teacher code switches in order to transfer the necessary knowledge for the students for clarity. Following the instruction in target language, the teacher code switches to native language in order to clarify meaning, and it in this way, stressed the importance of the foreign language content for efficient comprehension. However, the tendency to repeat the instruction in the native language may lead to some desired student behaviors. A learner who is sure that

the instruction in foreign language will be followed by a native language translation may lose interest in listening to the former instruction which will have negative academic consequences, as the student is exposed to foreign language discourse in a limited way.

Sundelin (2001) studied code switching in Finland and especially the reasons for the teachers of monolingual learners switch from one language to the other. Furthermore, she wanted to know what issues affect the teacher's choice of language (the students, the content and the context, and/or attitudes and beliefs of the individual teacher). Her data consisted of questionnaires to teachers. Her results showed that in a foreign language classroom a lot of Finnish is still used even in situations where the foreign language could be used. When resorting to the mother tongue, the teacher deprived the students of the opportunity to communicate naturally in the foreign language.

Yletyinen's (2004) study was a discourse analysis. The functions that she found were related to explanation, requesting for help, checking for understanding and admonitions. In addition, there were some functions which can be at least partly seen as caused by the lack of language skills, such as not knowing the English counterpart, clearing misunderstanding and self-corrections. The difference between official and unofficial talk was also brought up as code-switching was used to separate such uses of language and also to bring up students comments. However, she

summarized that English was mostly used for interaction related to the materials and Finnish for student-to-student interaction, questions that students ask from the teacher and in teacher admonitions.

Cashman (2005) examined social identities and code switching in bilingual talk-in-interaction. The data included conversations which took place in a senior citizens program, the participants of which were of varying backgrounds. The concept of identity was dealt with from a conversation analytic perspective. Cashman's study code switching serves functions of showing group membership and either resisting or accepting group membership ascribed by some other participant.

Cashman found that the participants talked into being social structure, social identities and linguistic identities. The social structures she found were the superiority of English and the lack of power and prestige of Spanish. Social identities were related to ethnic identity, e.g. Anglo, Chicana, or to the role a person takes in interaction, e.g. facilitator, which means a bilingual who helps monolingual English speakers to understand the Spanish remarks made by a bilingual. In the classroom, it showed different kind of identities is a relevant function, too. The teacher may move in and out of the role of the teacher.

Gil & Greggio (2007) reported that the analysis of the data collected was done through the classroom observation and the transcription analysis in Portuguese. It revealed an extensive use of code switching,

mainly L2→L1, in teacher –learner interaction. The functions of the teacher's code switching were: (1) to mark the beginning of class (L1→L2): The learners and the teacher were always interacting in Portuguese before starting the classes. When it was time for the class to begin, the teacher then switched the code into L2. (2) To get the learners' attention (L2→L1): when the teacher asked students questions in L2 and they paid no attention to the teacher questions and kept talking to each other in their L1, the teacher switched to L1 to get the students attention. (3) To maintain the planned structure of the class (L1→L2): after the teacher got the attention of the students, the teacher turns to L2 to keep the planned structure of the class. (4) To facilitate/clarify how to understand the grammatical rules and structures of (L2→L1). (5) To provide equivalent meaning(s) in L1/to translate vocabulary (L2→L1): when the learners did not know the meaning of L2 words or expressions, or when they asked the meaning of L2 words and expressions in Portuguese, they code switched. Before describing and illustrating this function, it is important to mention that there are many instances in which the teacher provided the meaning of L2 words or expressions by using synonyms or gestures. (6) To give advice (L2→L1): that when the teacher felt that the students did not understand what they listen to or saw,

the teacher would advise them to look in their books or to the source that presented the information for them.

Chapter Three

Methods and Procedures

3.0 Introduction

This chapter provides some insight on the methodology used in this study. It gives information about the population, the sample and the selection of participants. It also describes the validity and reliability of the instruments and finally it describes the steps and stages used in the study and conclude with data analysis.

3.1 Population and Sample of the Study

The population of the study includes all the EFL teachers and first secondary classes in Jordanian private schools. From this population a sample of (63) teachers and (200) students are selected from different schools in Amman. The sample is a purposive one because it is convenient to the researcher. Furthermore, the researcher has a good background and knowledge of the private schools and has friends who can help her in the research.

3.1.1 Selection of the Subjects

A number of samples were chosen for this study. The teachers of English sample consisted of 32 female teachers and 27 male teachers as shown in Table 1.

Table (1)

Teachers' Sample Showing Gender and Education.

Gender Level of Education	Female	Male	Total
Bachelor Degree	29	26	55
Diploma	1	1	2
Master Degree	1		1
Total	31	27	58

In the target sample, it was noticed that 95% of the teachers hold a BA degree, 3.4% hold a Diploma and 1.6% hold a Master degree. Teachers who have been teaching English between one-five years were over 37% while between six-ten years were over 36% and between 11-15 were over 15% and between 16-20 years were over 10%. Over 95% of the teachers

have attended one-three years in-service teacher-education training related to teaching methods and computer skills.

The students' sample was drawn randomly and consisted of 21 schools in west Amman (see Appendix G, 102). Only five schools were chosen from the list to respond to the students' questionnaire. Students from the first secondary classes were chosen to participate in the study. Their teachers of English were asked to distribute the questionnaire to them. The students' sample consisted of 59 female students and 109 male students, as shown in Table 2.

Table (2)
Students' Sample According to Gender.

Gender Grade	Female	Male	Total
1 st secondary stage	59	109	168
Total	59	109	168

The students' sample included the literary, scientific and information technology (IT) streams of the first secondary classes as shown in Table 3.

Table (3)
Students' Sample According to Streams in the Five Schools.

Stream School	IT	Scientific	Literary	Female	Male

Prince Hamzah	11	12	12		35
International	21	12	19	19	41

Stream	IT	Scientific	Literary	Female	Male
School					
Zahra'a	—	13	13	13	13
Reyadeya	—	12	15	12	15
Abd el-Hameed Sharaf	—	20	—	12	8
Total	32	69	54	56	112
			Total	168	

The sample used in the Semi-Structured Interviews consisted of four teachers of English who expressed their willingness to participate. They were teachers who taught the first secondary grade .They were interviewed to discuss their attitudes toward CS and the reasons for using this technique in the English classes. They were three female teachers and one male. All of them had a BA degree. The sample of teachers who participated in the observation consisted of four teachers. They agreed to be observed in their classrooms. The observed lessons were three for each teacher. These lesson observations were conducted to study the real reasons behind the use of Arabic in the teachers' English classes.

3.2 Instruments

Three instruments were used in this study: an observation checklist, semi-structured interview questions, teachers' questionnaire and students' questionnaire. Each one was followed by its validity and reliability procedures.

3.2.1 Observation

Using this research technique, the researcher had the capability of gaining information about both the teachers' and students' competence in using English in the EFL classrooms and to realize the real reasons for the teachers' code switching while teaching English. (See appendix C, p. 77-78).

The checklist contained items that were related to observing the classroom techniques, teachers', and students' competence. It contained three dimensions; the first one which consisted of seven items was related to the teacher' competence; the second one which consisted of nine items was related to the students' competence; the third which consisted of six items was related to the interaction grammar and vocabulary.

3.2.1.1 Validity of the Classroom Observation Checklist

The observed checklist was sent to a panel of experts whose participation was requested for establishing the content validity of the

checklist. The jury determined the face and content validity of the checklist items and the researcher implemented their suggestions.

3.2.1.2 Reliability of the Classroom Observation Checklist

To establish the reliability of the observation checklist, three teachers who were not part of the main sample and their classes were selected to be observed. After one week, it was administered again for the second time and the results showed stability in the answers.

3.2.2 Semi-Structured Interviews

To insure the observation validity and to improve the reliability of observation, the researcher combined it with semi-structured interviews. This tool is considered one of the most important techniques in gathering information. To elaborate, a major advantage of the interview is that the researcher can get more information that the questionnaire may not provide i.e. the way in which a response is made (the tone of voice, facial expressions, hesitation, etc.). The researcher introduced herself and explained the purpose of the interview in order to alleviate the tension of the participants and gain their trust.

The researcher interviewed a number of teachers informally in order to form a clear idea about the code switching phenomena in EFL classes and

also about the EFL teachers. These interviews consisted of six questions whose aim was to find out whether the teachers have used the code switching technique in their classrooms consciously or unconsciously. And to solicit their suggestions for improving the situation of English medium classes at secondary school in Jordan. (See Appendix D, p. 79-82)

The structured interviews can provide data that are more reliable and can be designed to avoid biases in the line of questioning. The researcher conducted the interviews herself by making appointments with the interviewees. All interview methods, including structured interviews, worked best when the participant was relaxed and at ease.

3.2.2.1 Validation of the Interview Questions

The semi-structured interviews questions were prepared in advance and were validated by the same panel of experts. Their comments were taken and implemented.

3.3 Questionnaires

3.3.1 Teachers' Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire was to reveal the teachers' attitudes and reasons of using the CS technique in their EFL classrooms (see Appendix E, p.83-87). The dimensions and statements that were included in the questionnaire were written with reference to Panta's *Code Switching*

in Secondary Level Classroom Teaching. Some items were dropped and some modifications were made to suit the population of the study. A Five–Likert scale was used for the subjects' responses on the statements.

The questionnaire consisted of three dimensions: the first one dealt with demographic data about the participants. The second dimension dealt with the attitudes of teachers towards CS which were divided into three parts: teachers' competence that consisted of 13 items, students' competence that consisted of seven items and interactions in the class that consist of two items. The third dimension dealt with the reasons for teachers' code switching and was divided into three parts: teachers' competence, which consisted of eight items; students' competence, which consisted of eleven items and grammar and vocabulary, which consisted of six items.

3.3.2 Students' Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire was to reveal the students' attitudes toward using the CS technique in their EFL classrooms. Two forms of the questionnaire were presented to students to choose one from them. The first was written in English; the second was written in Arabic and the students chose the Arabic one. (See Appendix F, p.88-95). The dimensions and statements that were included in the questionnaire were written with reference to Panta's *Code Switching in Secondary Level Classroom*

Teaching. Some items were dropped and some modifications were made to suit the population of the study. The questionnaire tried to draw out the students' attitudes toward their teachers CS, which consisted of eighteen questions and each one proposed four options so the students could choose one of them.

3.3.3 Validity of the Questionnaire

The questionnaires were sent to a panel of experts, whose participation was requested for establishing content validity of the questionnaire. The jurors were asked to review the phrasing, suitability, thoroughness and ease of use of the instruments. Some changes were made in the wording of some statements and a few statements were deleted. The final copy of the questionnaires was developed and distributed to the subjects of the study.

3.3.4 Reliability of the Questionnaires

To establish the reliability of the questionnaires, four teachers and fifteen students who were excluded from the main samples were selected to respond to the items of the questionnaire. After one week, it was administered again for the second time and the results showed stability in the answers.

3.4 Design of the Study

This research is a qualitative study that explores the reasons and attitudes of teachers toward CS in EFL classes and students' attitudes towards their teachers' CS. Thus, this part involves ongoing fieldwork using questionnaires, lesson observations, and conducting semi-structured interviews with the subjects of the study.

3.5 Research Procedures

The research procedures started with a review of various research and references for the purpose of building the instruments of the current study and to set the research procedures.

The researcher prepared and organized the teachers' questionnaire, the semi-structured interview questions, and the observation checklist items and established their validity by a panel of experts and set up their reliability. Then, the researcher selected the sample to apply on it the instruments of the study, which were performed during the last two weeks of October (16th – 26th), 2009.

After the data were collected, the researcher categorized, classified and analyzed it by putting them in tables and calculated their means and percentages. The answers of the interviews were analyzed and organized according to their categories. The items of the checklist were analyzed too.

Chapter Four

Results of the Study

4.0 Introduction

This chapter reports the findings of the three questions raised by the study. The questions are:

1. What are the attitudes of Jordanian EFL teachers towards CS in EFL classrooms?
2. Why do Jordanian EFL teachers resort to CS in EFL classes?
3. What are the students' attitudes towards teachers' CS?

The findings of the questionnaire are described, narrated and illustrated in tables. The chapter concludes with the analysis of the observations and the semi-structured interviews.

4.1 Results of Question One

What are the attitudes of Jordanian EFL teachers towards CS in EFL classrooms?

A sample of 58 EFL teachers in Private Secondary Schools in west Amman responded to the questionnaire. Results of the first question are shown in Table 4.

Responses to the first statement show that while 48.3% of the teachers are neutral and are not sure if the use of Arabic is enjoyable or not, 29.3% agree that CS is enjoyable and that only 5.3% strongly disagree.

Responses to the second statement show that 69% believe that CS helps both teachers and students, 29.3% disagree and 1.7% of teachers are neutral. Answers related to the third statement show that 50% of teachers are not sure if CS should be used always or not, 29.3% of them disagree while 20.7% agree on this statement. Responses of statement four indicate that 41.4% of teachers are neutral; 34.5% agree while 24.1% disagree that CS has a positive impact on English language learning.

Responses to item five show that 51.7% of teachers disagree; 29.3% neutral and only 19% agree that translation should be used instead of CS.

Answers given to item six show that 72.4% claim that CS enhances interaction in the classroom; 24.1% neutral and only 3.4% disagreed.

Item seven shows that 44.8% agree that CS increases the speed of learning\ teaching English; 36.2% neutral and about 18.9% disagree.

Statement eight shows that 63.8% agree that CS impedes the students' oral communication; 22.4% disagree while 13.8% neutral. Statement nine

indicates that 53.4% agree that Arabic should be rarely used in the English classes; 32.8% disagree and about 13.8% neutral. Responses to

item 10 show that 51.7% agree and 43.1% disagree while about 5.2% are not sure if CS has a negative impact on English learning or not. The last

statement shows that 55.2% agree that CS should be control as far as possible; 36.6% neutral and only 8.6% disagree.

Summary of results to question one shows that statement six ranks first in terms of its means which is (3.68) and the direction of the sample answers is very high. While statement five ranks last; its means is (2.67) and the direction of the sample answers is between high and low.

Table (4)
Percentages and Means for the Teachers' Attitudes toward CS

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Means
	%*	%	%	%	%	
1. I think code switching is enjoyable.	-	29.3	48.3	19	3.4	3.0345
2. I think that code switching helps both teachers and students.	-	69	1.7	29.3	-	3.3966
3. I think that code switching should be always used in the classroom.	-	20.7	50	29.3	-	2.9138
4. I think that code switching has a positive impact on English language learning.	-	34.5	41.4	24.1	-	3.1034
5. I believe that translation should be used instead of code switching.	-	19	29.3	51.7	-	2.6724
6. I believe that code switching enhances interaction in the classroom.	-	72.4	24.1	3.4	-	3.6897
7. I believe that code switching increases the speed of learning / teaching English.	1.7	43.1	36.2	10.3	8.6	3.1897

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Means
	%*	%	%	%	%	
8. I believe that code switching impedes the students' oral communication.	8.6	55.2	13.8	20.7	1.7	3.4828
9. I believe that code switching should be rarely used in the classroom.	8.6	44.8	13.8	27.6	5.2	3.2414
10. I believe that code switching has a negative impact on English language learning.	-	51.7	5.2	43.1	-	3.0862
11. I believe that code switching should be controlled as far as possible.	13.8	41.4	36.6	8.6	-	3.6034
	Total					3.21

* Key words: (Percentage = %)

4.2 Results of Question Two

Why do Jordanian EFL teachers resort to CS in EFL classes?

Results reported in table 5 below show why the teachers resort to CS in the classroom. Responses to the first statement show that 50% are neutral, 36.2% agree that they resort to CS to make the students familiar with the two languages and only 13.8% disagree. Item two shows that 51.7% agree that CS helps students to ask questions, 37.9% are neutral and not decided if it helps or not while only 10.3% disagree. Item three

indicates that 53.5% of teachers agree; 34.5% neutral and only 12.1% disagree. Answers of item four show that 41.1% of respondents believe that CS develops the students' communicative competence, 37.9% are neutral and about 20.75 disagree. Responses to the fifth statement show that 46.6% disagree; 31% are neutral and only 22.4% agree that students enjoy using Arabic language in the classroom. Statement six reports that 43.1% disagree; 31% of teachers agree that it is easy to explain the lesson in Arabic and only 28.9% are neutral. Answers related to statement seven indicate that 41.1% of teachers have agreed; 37.9% are not sure if CS makes students feel comfortable in class while 20.7% disagree. Item eight shows that the direction of responses is negative as 36.6% of teachers disagree; 34.5% agree that use of CS is to make sure that students understand almost every word that is said in the class and 25.95% are neutral.

Table 5
Percentages and Means for the Teachers' Reasons for Using CS

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Means
	%	%	%	%	%	
1. I code switch to make the students familiar with the two languages.	3.4	32.8	50	13.8	-	3.2586
2. I code switch to help the students ask	6.9	44.8	37.9	10.3	-	3.4828

questions.						
3. I code switch to help the students give answers.	12.1	41.4	34.5	12.1	-	3.5345

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Means
	%	%	%	%	%	
4. I code switch to develop the students' communicative competence.	6.9	34.5	37.9	20.7	-	3.2759
5. I code switch because the students enjoy using Arabic language in the classroom.	-	22.4	31	46.6	-	2.7586
6 I code switch because it is easy to explain the lesson in Arabic.	10.3	20.7	28.9	34.5	8.6	2.8966
7. I code switch to make students feel comfortable in class.	-	41.1	37.9	19	1.7	3.1897
8. I code switch to make sure that students understand almost every word that is said.	-	34.5	25.9	5.6	31	2.6379
9. I code switch to compare the two languages.	-	41.4	41.4	8.6	8.6	3.1552
10. I code switch because it facilitates understanding.	5.2	36.2	50	8.6	-	3.3793
11. I code switch to explain a task or an assignment.	17.2	37.9	36.2	8.6	-	3.6379

12. I code switch to encourage the students when they face a difficulty.	6.9	81	12.1	-	-	3.8276
--	-----	----	------	---	---	--------

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Means
	%	%	%	%	%	
13. I code switch to reinforce good performance.	46.6	8.6	43.1	1.7	-	3.0000
14. I code switch to discuss the format of an upcoming test.	-	63.8	27.6	8.6	-	3.1897
15. I code switch to make sure that weaker students do not fall behind.	8.6	60.3	31	-	-	3.7759
16. I code switch to help the students make reasonable guesses about unknown English words.	-	32.8	41.4	25.9	-	3.0690
17. I use code switching to encourage the students to speak and have discussion.	-	29.3	46.6	24.1	-	3.0517
18. I resort to code switching to help the students explain their problems.	-	65.5	17.2	17.2	-	3.4828
19. I code switch because it helps the students to learn fast.	29.3	37.9	31	1.7	-	2.9483
20. I code switch to explain cultural items (related to	-	62.1	29.3	8.6	-	3.5345

Arabic culture).						
21. I code switch because the passage / text has technical words.	-	36.2	43.1	15.5	5.2	3.1034

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Means
	%	%	%	%	%	
22. I code switch because I am not competent in English.	-	-	-	20.7	49.3	1.2069
23. I code switch because the students' level in English is poor.	-	46.6	20.7	27.6	5.2	3.0862
24. I code switch to explain the meaning of a reading passage.	-	19	36.2	15.5	29.3	2.4483
25. I code switch to explain grammar.	24.1	12.1	31	32.8	-	3.2759
	Total					3.21

Key words: (Percentage = %)

Answers given to item nine indicate that 41.1% agree, similarly 41.1% are neutral and only 17.2 disagree that the use of CS is to compare the two languages. Item 10 shows that 50% are neutral; 41.4% agree that CS facilitates understanding while only 8.6% disagree. Responses to statement 11 tend to show that 55.1% of teachers resort to CS to explain a task or assignment; 36.2% are neutral and 8.6% disagree. Statement 12 shows that 87.9% agree that CS encourages their students when they face

a difficulty and 12.1% are neutral. Responses to item 13 show that 55.2% agree; 43.1% are neutral while 1.7% disagree that teachers code switch to reinforce good performance. Item 14 shows that 63.8% of teachers believe that the use of CS helps in discussing the format of an upcoming test; 27.6% are neutral and only 8.6% disagree. Item 15 indicates that 68.9% agree while 31% of teachers are not sure if CS may help weaker students not fall behind.

Responses given to item 16 show that 41.1% are neutral, 32.8% agree that they code switch to help the students make reasonable guesses about unknown English words and about 25.9% disagree. Statement 17 indicates that 46.6% of teachers are not sure about their use for CS to encourage the students to speak and have discussion whereas, 29.3% agree and 24.1% disagree. Answers related to statement 18 show that 65.5% agree, 17.2% disagree and 17.2% are neutral about whether resorting to CS could help students to explain their problems. Whereas 67.2% agree to statement 19, only 31% of teachers are neutral and about 1.7% disagree that their CS helps students to learn fast. Statement 20 shows that teachers who agree that they code switch to explain a cultural item are 62.1%; 29.3% neutral and 8.6% disagree.

Responses to statement 21 show that 43.1% of teachers are not sure if they code switch because a text has technical words while 36.2% agree and 20.7% disagree. Answers given to item 22 show a negative direction.

It shows that 70% of teachers insist that they are competent in English. Item 23 indicates that 46.6% agree, 32.8% disagree while 20.7% are not sure if they code switch because of students poor level in English. Item 24 shows that 44.8% of teachers disagree; 63.2% are neutral while only 19% agree that their use of CS is to explain the meaning of a reading passage. The last statement indicates that 36.2% of teachers agree that they code switch to explain grammar, 32.8% disagree and about 31% disagree.

Summary of results to question two shows that statement 12 ranks first in terms of its means (3.82) and the direction of the sample answers tends to be the highest. The statement that ranks last is number 22 as its means is (1.20) and the direction of the sample answers tends to be the lowest.

4.3 Results of Question Three

What are the students' attitudes towards teachers' code switching?

A sample of 168 students of the first secondary stage, who learn at private secondary schools in west Amman, had responded to the prepared questionnaire, which consisted of 18 statements. The means, percentages for each statement were calculated and shown in table 6.

Responses to the first statement show that 100% of students agree that their teachers use Arabic in the English classes. Answers related to statement two show that 41.7% of the students notice that sometimes teachers use Arabic while teaching in the English classes; 23.8% very

often and 22.6% rarely. Responses to statement three show that 59.5% believe that teachers use CS for the understanding of the students, 17.9% as it is easy to explain in Arabic while 16.7% of students decide that teachers are not competent in English. Statement four indicates that 41.7% of students chose literary words that demand the use of Arabic; 31.1% technical words and 25% concrete words. Statement five shows that 40.5% decide that abstract words of general concepts need Arabic; 26.2% cultural concept and 19.9% of students find that religious concepts need Arabic. Answers given to statement six show that 29.8% of students believe that names of institutions need the use of Arabic; 28.6% for names of commodities and 23.8% for names of plants and animals. Responses to statement seven shows that 27.4% of students believe that the passage with a complex story needs the use of Arabic, 26.2% the one with difficult words while 25% are the words not related to Arabic culture. Statement eight indicates that 39.3% of students find that the use of Arabic in the English classes was necessary to give meaning, 32.8% was necessary for discussion and 19% to explain the new structure. Statement nine indicates that 31.1% of students tend to believe that when teachers always use Arabic in the English classes it helps them to be familiar with the two languages while 29.8% think it hinders learning the English language and 20.2% believe it helps learning

Answers related to statement 10 show that 45.2% of students believe that the use of Arabic hinders learning the English language, 29.8% has a situational effect while 13.1% believe it facilitates learning English. Statement 11 indicates that 28.6% of students use Arabic to refuse to speak to their teachers, 25% to ask questions and 23.8% to explain their own problems. For statement 12 responses show that 29.8% of students believe that teachers should use Arabic when the situation demands; 28.6% say rarely while 23.8% say occasionally. Statement 13 shows that 34.5% of students decide that the use of Arabic is for the need of both teachers and students; 29.8% students and 23.8% none. Responses related to statement 14 indicate that 29.8% of students need to speak in Arabic because of the mother tongue influence, 22.6% because of the learning environment and 17.9% because of the cultural background. Responses to statement 15 show that 34.5% of students believe that teachers need to speak in Arabic when they want to compare the two languages; 23.8% when the teacher is not competent in English and 22.6% when the teacher is not familiar with Arabic culture. Responses given to statement 16 show that 27.4% of students find that it is interesting to take all classes in English; 25% believe it is not interesting; 23.8% agree and 23.8% disagree. Answers related to statement 17 show that 35.7% of students believe that the use of Arabic had a negative impact on the speaking skill of the English language; 27.4% believe it had a negative impact on the

writing skill and 19.9% on the listening skill. The last statement shows that 29.8% of students state that when the teacher uses Arabic, it helps them to point out problems they face in the material; 28.6% helps them to thank the teacher for helping them while 23.8% believes it helps them to know the format of the upcoming test.

Summary of results to question three shows that statement 14 ranks first in terms of its means (2.71) and the direction of the sample answers is very high. While statement 10 ranks last; its means is (2.08) and the direction of the sample answers is between low and high.

Table 6: Percentages and Means for Students' Attitudes towards Teachers' CS .

Options Questions	A	B	C	D	Means
1. Does your EFL teacher use both languages Arabic and English?	Yes	No			1.00
	100%	0%			
2. How often does your teacher use Arabic while teaching in the English class?	Very often	Sometimes	Rarely	Occasionally	2.22
	23.8%	41.7%	22.6%	11.9%	
3. Why do you think s/he uses Arabic?	He / She is not competent in the English	It is easy for him/her to explain in Arabic	It is used for the understanding of the students	S/he enjoys using Arabic language in the classroom	2.54
	16.7%	17.9%	59.5%	6%	
4. What kind of lexical words demand the use of Arabic?	Concrete	Abstract	Literary	Technical	2.42
	25%	20.2%	41.7%	31.1%	
5. What kind of abstract	Religious concepts	Cultural concepts	Geographical concepts.	General concepts	2.53
	19.9%	26.2%	15.5%	40.5%	

words need Arabic?					
6. What kind of concrete words need the use of Arabic?	Names of institutions	Names of plants and animals	Names of commodities	Names of vehicles	2.34
	29.8%	23.8%	28.6%	17.9%	
7. What kind of passage needs the use of Arabic language?	Having difficult words.	Giving complex story	Describing specialized field.	Unrelated to Arabic culture	2.45
	26.2%	27.4%	21.4%	25%	

Options Questions	A	B	C	D	Means
8. Why is the use of Arabic in the English classroom necessary?	To give meaning	To explain new structure	To have discussion	To encourage the students to speak	2.20
	39.3%	19%	23.8%	17.9%	
9. What happens if the teacher always uses Arabic in the English classes?	It helps me in learning.	It makes familiar with two languages.	It hinders learning English language.	It hinders in learning Arabic	2.45
	20.2%	32.1%	29.8%	17.9%	
10. Does the use of Arabic language in the English classroom facilitate learning?	No, it hinders	Yes, it facilitates	It has situational effect	It has no effect at all	2.08
	45.2%	13.1%	29.8%	11.9%	
11. For what purpose do you use Arabic in the English class?	To ask questions	To give answers	To refuse to speak	To explain own problem	2.51
	25%	22.6%	28.6%	23.8%	
12. How	Very often	Occasionally	Rarely	When the	2.70

often do you feel the teacher should use Arabic language?				situation demands	
	17.9%	23.8%	28.6%	29.8%	
13. who need to use the Arabic language in the English classes?	Teachers.	Students.	Both.	None.	2.70
	11.9%	29.8%	34.5%	23.8%	

Options Questions	A	B	C	D	Means
14. Why do the students' need to speak in Arabic?	Because of cultural background	Because of the learning environment.	Because of the influence of the mother tongue	All of the above	2.71
	17.9%	22.6%	29.8%	29.8%	
15. In which cases do the teachers need to speak in Arabic?	When the teacher is not familiar with English culture.	When the teacher is not familiar with Arabic culture	When the teacher wants to teach by comparing two languages.	When the teacher is not competent in the target language.	2.63
	19%	22.6%	34.5%	23.8%	
16. How do you feel about taking all classes in English except Arabic?	Agree	Disagree	Interesting	Not interesting as it is compulsion	2.53
	23.8%	23.8%	27.4%	25%	
17. The use of Arabic language in the English class has a negative impact on	It does not develop the listening skill for English	It does not develop the speaking skill for English	It does not develop the writing skill for English	It does not develop the reading skill for English	2.47
	19.9%	35.7%	27.4%	19%	

the student as:					
18. When my teacher uses Arabic in the English class it helps me in:	Understanding my homework	Thanking my teacher for his/her help for me	knowing the format of the upcoming test	Showing what type of problems that I face in the material	2.65
	17.9%	28.6%	23.8%	29.8%	

4.4 Analysis of the Semi-Structured Interviews

Four teachers of English who teach the first secondary classes have been interviewed to discuss their views about using CS in their classes. The interviewed teachers are teachers of English at the Private Secondary schools in west Amman; three of them are females and one a male. All of them have B.A degrees in English language and literature from different Jordanian universities and all teach the first and second secondary classes.

The first female teacher works at Al-Redwan private secondary school and has been teaching English for 17 years. She has attended different teachers' courses to develop her proficiency in teaching English and gain various strategies to be used in teaching English. Through the informal interviews, she accepts the use of CS and describes it in two words "helpful technique". She denies that the teachers' incompetence is behind the teachers' use of (CS). She uses this technique because of the students' poor level in English language and the high level of the teaching material. She gives four reasons for (CS) such as new difficult words, new

structures, and students' weakness in English and for the sake of controlling her class sometimes. The formal interview consists of 10 questions with multiple choice answers. She claims that she often uses English in her class and not always, but sometimes she uses Arabic in the English language class and her real main reason for using Arabic is to explain new structures. Based on her experience, she believes that students reach to the secondary school while they are so weak in English grammar. They understand English better when the teacher explains it in Arabic. She even accepts the use of Arabic in English classes but also admits that this technique hinders the learning process of English as the students would be sure that their teachers would again explain the lesson in Arabic. She states that CS is used only to meet the students' needs, and they need that because of their weakness in English. She points out that she code switches because she is not always familiar with the English culture, and she needs English because it helps students to learn fast, and it facilitates interaction with students.

The second female teacher works at Al Dur Al-Manthor private secondary school and she has been teaching English for nine years. She has attended only two courses for EFL teachers. In the informal interviews, she claims that code switching is a good way in teaching and has many positive points. She does not agree with the people who blame the teacher for her\his incompetence in English. She uses CS because of

the students' poor level in English and different levels of students that force the teacher to use Arabic. She gives her reasons for CS as it helps students to understand the material and helps her to gain time so she can finish the material on time as the school system insists on that. In addition, grammar and new vocabulary require the use of Arabic in the English classes. In the formal interview, she presents her views about CS as she frankly mentions that she uses both languages and mostly Arabic to encourage students to express their ideas, and she gives Arabic language a space in the English classes so students can explain their problems in learning English because it is their need to use Arabic in the English class not her.

The third female teacher works at Al-Nokhba private secondary school and she has been teaching English for 2 years only. She has only attended the course for new teachers. She rejects the use of the CS technique in the English classes because in this way students would never learn the English language correctly. She claims that teachers and students incompetence that stands behind using CS in the class. Her two main reasons for CS in English classes are the students' poor level at English and that the school system wants teachers to do anything just to help the students to pass the final exams and to move to the next level. During the formal interviews, she insists on using English only in her classes and on occasional use of Arabic. She finds that this technique

hinders the students' ability to learn English. According to her, students use Arabic in the English classes because of their weakness in English while the teacher uses Arabic because s\he is not competent in English. The school environment may force her to use Arabic in her English classes.

The only male teacher works at Al-Qema Private Secondary School and he has been teaching English for 4 years. He has attended the course for new teachers. His opinion about the Arabic use in English classes is that it sometimes helps the teacher as he faces different levels of students, and it helps in some way but not always. The reasons he chooses for (CS) are grammar and vocabulary to control his classes and to catch their attention for something important he wants to say.

In the formal interview, he points out that he sometimes uses both languages in the class and mainly to explain a new structure for the students. If he uses Arabic, it is because of the students' demand to help them, to learn fast and make it easy for them.

4.5 Analysis of the Classroom Observations

The four teachers, who were interviewed, have been requested to be observed while teaching. The researcher used the observation checklist.

The observed lessons were three for each teacher and the first lesson dealt with a reading comprehension text that contained new words and concepts. The second lesson dealt with grammar and the last one was a

revision for what they taught during the last two lessons. The observation was carried out for four days. The function of the lesson observation was to examine what really took place concerning the use of the code switching technique use in the English language classroom.

The first teacher teaches English at Al-Redwan Private Secondary School. The researcher observed three lessons in three days like she did with the other teachers. Through out the three lessons, the researcher noticed that the teacher sometimes used Arabic and other times it avoided by using translation. She asked her students to prepare the new and difficult words by checking the meanings in English-English dictionaries. In addition, students brought dictionaries with them to class to be used if needed. The teacher needed to use Arabic to make sure that weaker students understood the lesson and the new structure (grammar). For the interaction inside class, she accepted that her students asked her questions in Arabic and answered in Arabic. She used Arabic to thank her students for their good performance in general.

The second teacher teaches English at Al-Qimma Private Secondary School. The researcher observed three lessons in three days. She used Arabic very often in her classroom, and she resorted to Arabic to explain new words and made sure that her students understood the lessons, specially the weaker ones. For interaction, she gave the students the chance to ask questions and gave answers in Arabic. The researcher also

observed that she resorted to Arabic to teach faster especially in grammar lessons and to encourage her students to talk about their problems and for the sake of preparing them for the test and doing their home works and to thank them for their good cooperation in the class activities.

The third teacher teaches English at Al-Nokhba Private Secondary School. It was completely different in her classroom. The researcher remarked that she almost did not use Arabic at all; she rarely used this technique and her students always had dictionaries to use in class to give the meaning of new words or flash cards that represent the meaning of these words or even sketches that help them to get the meaning. However, sometimes she needed to give the meaning in Arabic. She allowed students to use Arabic in a limited way if they really could not express themselves or answer questions. When her students worked in groups, she observed their language and gave extra marks for the group that used English as much as possible. She even gave them a space to use Arabic and to develop their communicative competence. She allowed them to use Arabic to discuss assignments and upcoming tests and to thank them for their good performance. Her weaker students forced her in some situations to use Arabic. In grammar, she tried as much as possible to use English.

The fourth teacher teaches English at Al-Qema Private Secondary School. The researcher observed three lessons in three days. The teacher

sometimes used CS in teaching English and avoided it in other times by using translation. He asked his students to use dictionaries inside the class if they faced difficult words. Moreover, to enhance the interaction in class and help his students to speak and ask questions and give answers, he accepted the use of Arabic and gave them the assignments and the expected questions that may come in the upcoming test. He used CS for good interaction in the activities inside the class and to encourage weaker students to overcome their problems and sometime in explaining grammar lessons.

Chapter Five

Discussion and Recommendations

5.0 Introduction

This chapter renders a brief summary and a short discussion of the findings of the three research questions. It also attempts to explain and interpret the results in the light of the reviewed literature. The chapter concludes with recommendations and suggestions for future research.

5.1 Discussion of the Findings of Question One: *What are the attitudes of Jordanian EFL teachers towards CS in EFL classroom?*

Results displayed in the previous chapter show that CS as a technique used in EFL Jordanian classrooms has been positively evaluated by the participants as it is shown in table 4, (p. 43-44). This positive attitude is based on the high percentages of items (2, 6, 7, 9) that show teachers' awareness about the positive attitudes toward CS.

Items (2, 6) show that over 69% of teachers support the use of CS as it helps both teachers and students and enhances interaction in the classroom. It seems that teachers support the use of CS in EFL classes

because items (7, 9) indicate that CS increases the speed of learning/teaching English, These findings are similar to Piasecka (1988) and Canagarajah (1995).

However, based on items (5, 8, 9, 10, 11) in the same table, it seems also that other teachers are concerned about the negative effect of CS. Items (5, 8, 9) show that even though CS helps teachers in increasing the speed of teaching English, 55% of teachers find that CS also impedes students' oral communication. Items (10, 11) show that over 50% teachers are concerned about the right of students to acquire the language with its four skills correctly. By expressing their feelings about the strengths and weakness of CS, teachers have shown that they are objective in their attitudes toward CS. This result is in agreement with Atkinson (1987).

5.2 Discussion of the Findings of Question Two: *Why does Jordanian EFL teachers resort to CS in EFL classes?*

Results reported in table 5, (p. 45-48) show that the following reasons as presented in items (2, 3, 11, 12, 13) score higher than 60%. This means that these reasons are effective from the point of view of teachers in resorting to CS.

According to items (2, 3, 11), 50% of teachers code switch to help their students to ask questions about anything they misunderstand and give answers to prove that they understand the new lesson. This is because the students' background in English vocabularies is not sufficient. Therefore,

item (12) shows that 87.9 of teachers code switch to encourage the students when they face difficulties in expressing their ideas. They also, can do their tasks inside the classroom as groups or individuals. The teachers may praise students' good performance when they work together and do what they are asked for. These results are in line with Skiba (1997) and Mattson & Burenhult (1999).

Items (14, 15, 18, 19, 20) show other reasons for teachers CS. Items (14, 15, 18) show that 66% of teachers code switch to prepare students for their tests and to give them hints about some questions that may come. It is important for teachers to let their students earn the highest marks or even full marks which prove that they are good teachers and also use suitable ways in teaching English. According to items (19, 20, 24), 65% of teachers believe that the use of CS helps them to make sure that weaker students do not fall behind by revising the words and checking their understanding of grammar and the meaning of reading passages. This outcome is in agreement with Nizegordcew (1999) and Cook (2001).

However, results have shown that CS has a negative effect, which is shown in items (6, 22, 24). Item (6) shows that over 59% of teachers reject the use of CS in their EFL classes as it is easier for them to explain the lesson by using the Arabic language instead of English. Item (22) shows that over 70% of teachers claim that they are fluent in English and

that the occurrence of CS in their classes is the result of students' weakness in English.

5.3 Discussion of the Findings of Question Three: *What are the students' attitudes towards teachers' CS?*

Results pointed out in table 6, (p.53-55) show that students are fully aware of the use of CS by their teachers. Over 59% of students believe that their teachers code switch for the benefit of the students themselves and not because their teachers are poor in English. In this way, teachers help them to overcome the difficulties they face. Almost 41% of students show that they need this technique to be used by their teachers to understand all kinds of words and their meanings. It shows that students really need CS. Also, at this age, students want to get everything in the easiest way especially education, so the use of CS helps them to learn and to understand the material fast. Also, students find that the use of CS is necessary to get the meaning so they can avoid the use of dictionaries and want their teachers to code switch in order to understand their homework.

Students prefer to use Arabic to thank their teachers for helping them and by using Arabic they can express their feelings in a better way and convey their messages to their teachers. This is in agreement with Turnbull (2001).

Results in table 6 has shown that 32% of students do not accept the use of CS as it hinders their chances to learn English correctly and hope that their teachers use CS when the situation demands. Over 35% of students are aware of their need to develop their speaking skill and students feel about taking all their classes in English is interesting. This is in agreement with Cook (2002).

5.4 Conclusions:

Data obtained indicated that EFL teachers have been using Arabic in their English classes basically to give a clear concept of the items or subjects in the teaching material. Teachers use Arabic to get the meaning across to the students. Some teachers code switch because it is easier for them to explain things, and it facilitates understanding materials for the students. However, according to the teachers' attitudes CS impedes the students' oral communication and they believe it should be used rarely as it has a negative impact on English language learning and it should be controlled as far as possible.

Teachers code switch because it helps students to develop their communicative competence by asking questions and giving answers and understand their homeworks and tests in order to overcome their problems and difficulties. These results indicate that CS helps students to understand grammar and new vocabulary and to thank them for their good performance in the classroom.

According to the students, Arabic should be used extensively in the English classes because it explains their own problems and some of them use it to ask questions and give answers. According to them CS is necessary to give the meaning of different types of words that demand the use of Arabic as it facilitates learning and helps them to be familiar with two languages and explains their problems easily.

5.5 Recommendations and Suggestions for Future Research:

On the bases of the results of this study, the researcher proposes a number of points to be taken into consideration by researchers:

- The study may be extended to different regions in Jordan. The sample may include the public and private schools for the purpose of detecting the differences between them.
- The difference between trained and untrained teachers may be compared in terms of code-switching to find out the type of training or orientation the teachers may need.

References

- Adendorff, R. D. (1996). The functions of code switching among high school teachers and students in KwaZulu and implications for teacher education. In M.B. Kathleen and D. Nunan, (Eds) *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education.*(PP. 388-406.) New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Alvarez-Caccamo, C. (1998). Code switching: Towards re-conceptualization of communicative codes. In P. Auer (Ed). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity.* (PP. 29-48.) London and New York: Routledge.
- Antón, M. & DiCamilla, F.(1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 54, 314-342.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal.* 41, 241-243.
- Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation.* Amersterdam: John Benjamin

- Bergsletthner, J. (2002) Grammar and interaction in the EFL classroom: A sociocultural study. Retrieved 5, December, from <http://rle.ucpel.tche.br/php/edicoes/v10n2/02Greegio%20e%20Gil.pdf>
- Bradley, C. J. (2003) *A diglot-weave experience with EFL university students*. Retrieved 31, January, from <http://www.hltnmag.co.uk/jan03.mart3.htm>
- Broughton, G., Brumfit, C., Flavell, R., Hill, P., & Pincas, A. (1978) *Teaching English as a foreign language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Retrieved 12, April, from <http://www.ieps.uob.edu.bh/Englishpdf\5-2.pdf>
- Butzkamm, W. (1998). Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: The mother tongue as a conversational lubricant. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 1, 81-99.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1995). Functions of code switching in ESL classrooms: Socializing bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 16, 173-195.
- Cashman, H. R. (2005). Identities at play: language preference and group membership in bilingual talk in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 37, 301-316.
- Castellotti and Moore (2002). Views on code switching. In M, Turnbull and K.Arnett. Teachers' uses of target language and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistic*. 22,204-218.

- Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, (57) 3. Retrieved 11, July from <http://www.utpjournals.com/jour.ihtml?lp=product/cmlr/573/573Cook.html>.
- Cook, V. (2002) *Second language learning and language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Di Pietro, R. (1975). Codeswitching as a verbal strategy among Bilinguals. In F. Eckman (Ed.) *Current themes in linguistics: bilingualism, experimental linguistics and language typologies*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Dweik, B. (1986). *Research papers in applied linguistic*. Hebron: Hebron University.
- Flyman-Mattsson, A & Burenhult-Mattsson, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers*. 47, 59-72.
- Greggio, S. & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learner's use of code-switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: A qualitative study. *Linguagem and Ensino*. 10 (2).. Retrieved 14, October, from: <http://rle.ucpel.tche.br/php/edicoes/v10n2/02Greggio%20e%20Gil.pdf>
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Guthrie, M. (1984). Contrasts in teachers' language use in a Chinese-English bilingual classroom'. In M, Martin-Jones. *Bilingual classroom research: A review of recent research. Language Teaching* 33,1-9.
- Hussein, R. (1999). *Code-Alteration among Arab college students*. Retrieved 6, June, from [http:// www.eric.edu.gov/ERICWebPortal/Custom/portlets/record details/detailmini.jsp?](http://www.eric.edu.gov/ERICWebPortal/Custom/portlets/record%20details/detailmini.jsp?)
- Moore, D. (2002). Case study: Code-switching and learning in the classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5, 279-293.
- Muysken, P. (1987). *Bilingual speech. A typology of code-switching*. Oxford: Cambridge University Press
- Myers-Scotton C., (1988) *Social motivations for code switching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schweers, C. (1999). Using 11 in 12 classroom. *The English teaching forum*. 37 (2). Retrieved 12, December, from: <http://xchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol37/no2/p6.htm>.
- Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*. 3, (8). Retrieved 3, October, from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html>
- Simon, D. (2001). Towards a new understanding of codeswitching in the foreign language classroom. In R. Jacobson (Ed.) *Code switching worldwide II* pp.311-342. -Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Skiba, R.(1997). Code Switching as a countenance of language interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*. 3, (10). Retrieved 6,June from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-Codeswitching.html>

Sundelin, M. (2001).Reasons for language switching in teaching English as a second language. Unprinted Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Helsinki. . Retrieved 5, December, from <http://www.eng.helsinki.fi/tutkimus/opinnaytetyot.html>.

Naser. T. R (1980). *The essential of linguistic science: Selected and simplified readings*. University of Indian: Longman. Retrieved 17, September, from <http://books.google.com/books?id=SavIAAAAMAAJ&dq=raja+naser+-+the+essential+of+linguistic&hl=ar>

Nawafleh .A. M. (2008). *Code Switching in the jordanian society*. Al Hussein Bin Talal University. Retrieved 8,October from <http://itsallaboutthewayyouliveyourlife.blogspot.com/2008/08/my-researcher-paper-on-code-switching-in.html>.

Nizegorodcew, A. (1996). The function of the native language in foreign language teacher-learner interaction. *Jyvaskyla Cross Language Studies* 17: 209-214.

Jacobson, R. (1990). *Codeswitching as a worldwide phenomenon*. NY: Peter Lang.

Ogaine, E. (1997). Codeswitching in EFL Learner Discourse. *JALT Journal*: 19: 106-122.

Piasecka, Krystyna. (1988).The bilingual teacher in the ESL classroom. In S. Nicholls and E. Hoadley-Maidment, (Eds). *Current issues*

inteaching English as a second language to adults PP. 97-107.

London: Edward Arnold..

Polio, C. G. and Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal* 78, 313-26.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *Canadian Modern Language Journal* 57, 531-40.

Valdés-Fallis, G. (1978). *Language in Education: Theory and practice: Code switching and the classroom teacher*. Arlington, VA: Arlington Center for Applied Linguistics.

Yletyinen, H. (2004). *The functions of codeswitching in EFL classroom discourse. A pro gradu thesis in English*. University of Jyväskylä. Retrieved 23, August, [from https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/7407/G0000707.pdf?sequence=1](https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/7407/G0000707.pdf?sequence=1)

Zentella, Ana Celia. (1981). Tá bien, you could answer me en cualquier idioma: Puerto Rican codeswitching in bilingual classrooms. In R. P. Duran, (Ed). *Latino language and communication behavior*. PP. 109-31. Norwood, NJ: ABLEX.

Appendix A
Middle East University Permission Letter

<p style="text-align: center;">Appendix B Panel of Experts and Validation letters</p>

- * Professor Adnan Al-Jadiri – Amman Arab University – Methodology/ Education.
- * Professor Awatef Shaer — Amman Arab University – TEFL/ Education.
- * Professor Riyadh Hussein – MEU - TEFL\ Linguistics.
- * Professor Rasoul Khafaji – MEU - TEFL\ Linguistics.
- * Professor Jawdat Saadeh – MEU – Methodology\Education.
- * Doctor Ghazi Khalifeh – MEU - Methodology\ Education.
- * Doctor Zaid Al-Shamaila – Isra' – TEFL\ Linguistics.

Dear Professor, Supervisor and Teacher:

I am currently in the process of determining the face and content validity of the survey instruments, which I am going to use for collecting data for my M.A. thesis titled (Attitudes and Reasons for Code Switching among Jordanian EFL Secondary School Teachers). I truly appreciate your comments as experts who will in helping determining the face and content validity of the three survey instruments: classroom observation checklist, semi-structured interviews and questionnaires for teachers and students.

I am grateful to you for the time you will take in commenting on the following questions:

1. Are the questions in the instruments related to the topic under investigation namely, teachers' attitudes and reasons of code switching?

2. Do the instruments measure what they are supposed to measure?

3. Are the items clear and their language appropriate?

Please feel free to make any additional suggestions:

Thank you again for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,
Mariam Niamat
M.A. Student\MEU.

<p>Appendix C Classroom Observation Checklist</p>

Classroom Observation Checklist

The following items characterize the components that will be observed in the English language classroom. The observer puts a tick next to the statement that is being noticed in the classroom. The observer describes the teacher interactions with students.

The teacher :	Tick
1. Always uses code switching in teaching English.	
2. Rarely uses code switching in teaching English.	
3. Sometimes uses code switching in teaching English.	
4. Avoids code switching by using translation largely.	
5. Code switches because when s\he explains vocabulary.	
6. Code switches when s\he is not sure that the students understand him\her.	
7. Code switches when s\he wants to explain a task or assignment.	
8. Code switches to help students ask questions.	
9. Code switches to help students answer questions.	
10. Code switches to develop their communicative competence.	
11. Code switches to reinforce students' good	

performance.	
12. Code switches to discuss the format of an upcoming test.	
13. Code switches to make sure that weaker students do not fall behind.	
14. Code switches to help students guess the unknown English words.	
15. Code switches to encourage students to talk about their problems.	
16. Code switches to help students learn fast.	
17. Code switches to enhance interaction in the class.	
18. Code switches to explain new grammar lesson.	
19. Code switches to explain the meaning of difficult passages.	
20. Code switches to explain new vocabulary.	
21. Code switches to discuss classroom events.	
22. Code switches to elicit Arabic equivalents of English.	
23. Others.	

Appendix D

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

The following are the questions and sub-questions that are going to be asked to the teachers during the semi-structured interview. The interview provides an in-depth information to interpret the data collected. The interviewee has been informed that the interview would take about twenty minutes.

Instructions for the researcher:

Ask for permission to interview the teacher.

Introduce yourself to break the ice.

Prepare the sheet that contains the questions with convenient space to take notes and reactions.

Informal interviews:

Open-ended questions:

Q1: How long have you been in this profession?

Q2: Have you attended teacher's training courses or workshops? How long?

Q3: How many periods do you teach in a day? Is it appropriate?

Q4: What is your opinion about altering between English and Arabic in the EFL classroom?

Q5: People believe that teacher's incompetence is the main cause of code switching? Do you agree? Why or why not?

Q6: For what reasons do you think teachers code switch in classes?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

Formal Interviews:

1. What language do you often speak in the classes?
 - a) Arabic
 - b) English
 - c) Both
 - d) Others

2. How often do you use Arabic while teaching English?
 - a) Very often
 - b) Sometimes
 - c) Rarely
 - d) Occasionally

3. Why is the use of Arabic in the English language classroom necessary?
 - a) To give meaning.
 - b) To explain new structure.
 - c) To have discussion.
 - d) To encourage the students to speak.

4. What happens if the teacher always uses Arabic in the English language classes?
 - a) It helps students to learn.
 - b) It familiarizes students with two languages.
 - c) It hinders learning the English language
 - d) It hinders learning the Arabic language.

5. For what purpose do you use Arabic in the English language classes?
 - a) To ask questions and to give answers
 - b) To elicit Arabic equivalents for English words.
 - c) To explain students' problems in learning English.
 - d) Others.

6. Who needs code switching?
 - a) Teachers
 - b) Students
 - c) Both
 - d) None

7. Why do the students need to speak in Arabic?
- a) Because the teacher always speaks in Arabic.
 - b) Because of the students weakness in English.
 - c) Because of the influence of the mother tongue (Arabic).
 - d) All the above.
8. In which cases do the teachers need to speak in Arabic?
- a) When the teacher is not familiar with English culture.
 - b) When the teacher is not familiar with Arabic culture.
 - c) When the teacher wants to compare the two languages.
 - d) When the teacher is not competent in the target language.
9. Why do you speak more Arabic in the classroom?
- a) Because I am not able to explain in English.
 - b) Because the students demand Arabic words.
 - c) Because it helps students to learn fast.
 - d) All of the above.
10. What inspires you to speak Arabic in the English language classes?
- a) The school environment dictates using Arabic.
 - b) To facilitate interaction with students.
 - c) The teachers' poor competence in English.
 - d) All of the above.

<p style="text-align: center;">Appendix E Teachers' Questionnaire</p>

Dear Teacher,

I am a graduate student at Middle East University for Graduate Studies (MEU). I am conducting a study for my M.A. degree. The purpose of this research is to collect information about the teachers' attitudes and reasons for using the code switching technique in the Private Jordanian Secondary English Language Classes.

I am requesting your participation, which will involve filling in the attached questionnaire. It should take between 10-15 minutes. The questionnaire is confidential.

Sincerely,
Mariam Niamat
M.A students\MEU.

Questionnaire for EFL Teachers:

This questionnaire aims at investigating code switching (altering between Arabic and English in the classroom) amongst EFL teachers in secondary schools. The researcher assures you that the information provided in response to the items in the questionnaire will be used for the sole purposes of academic research. Your cooperation in filling out the questionnaire as accurately as possible is highly appreciated.

The questionnaire consists of three parts: 1. demographic data. 2. Attitudes of teachers towards code switching. 3. Reasons for teachers' code switching.

Demographic Data:

Name of the school sex age.....

Teachers' level of education.....

Experience in teaching English:

(1) 1-5 (2) 6-10 (3) 11-15 (4) 16-20 (5) 20-30

Teachers' Attitudes toward Code Switching:

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I think code switching is enjoyable.					
2. I think that code switching helps both teachers and students.					
3. I think that code switching should be always used in the classroom.					

4. I think that code switching has a positive impact on English language learning.					
5. I believe that translation should be used instead of code switching.					
6. I believe that code switching enhances interaction in the classroom.					
7. I believe that code switching increases the speed of learning / teaching English.					
8. I believe that code switching impedes the students' oral communication.					
9. I believe that code switching should be rarely used in the classroom.					
10. I believe that code switching has a negative impact on English language learning.					
11. I believe that code switching should be controlled as far as possible.					

Reasons for Teachers' Code Switching:

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I code switch to make the students familiar with the two languages.					
2. I code switch to help the students ask questions.					
3. I code switch to help the					

students give answers.					
4. I code switch to develop the students' communicative competence.					
5. I code switch because the students enjoy using Arabic language in the classroom.					
6. I code switch because it is easy to explain the lesson in Arabic.					
7. I code switch to make students feel comfortable in class.					
8. I code switch to make sure that students understand almost every word that is said.					
9. I code switch to compare the two languages.					
10. I code switch because it facilitates understanding.					
11. I code switch to explain a task or an assignment.					
12. I code switch to encourage the students when they face a difficulty.					
13. I code switch to reinforce good performance.					
14. I code switch to discuss the format of an upcoming test.					
15. I code switch to make sure that weaker students do not fall behind.					
16. I code switch to help the students make reasonable guesses about unknown English words.					
17. I use code switching to encourage the students to speak and have discussion.					
18 I resort to code switching					

to help the students explain their problems.					
19 I code switch because it helps the students' to learn fast.					
20. I code switch to explain cultural items (related to Arabic culture).					
21. I code switch because the passage / text has a technical difficulty.					
22. I code switch because I am not competent in English.					
23. I code switch because the students' level in English is poor.					
24. I code switch to explain the meaning of a reading passage.					
25. I code switch to explain grammar.					

<p style="text-align: center;">Appendix F Students' Questionnaire</p>

Dear students,

I am a graduate student at Middle East University for Graduate Studies (MEU). I am conducting a study for my M.A. degree. The purpose of this research is to collect information about the students' attitudes towards using the code switching technique in the Private Jordanian Secondary English Language Classes.

I am requesting your participation, which will involve filling in the attached questionnaire. It should take between 10-15 minutes. The questionnaire is confidential.

Sincerely,
Mariam Niamat
M.A students\MEU.

9. What happens if the teacher always uses Arabic in the English classes?

- a) It helps me in learning.
- b) It makes me familiar with two languages.
- c) It hinders learning the English language.
- d) It hinders learning the Arabic language.

10. Does the use of Arabic in the English classroom facilitate the students' learning?

- a) No, it hinders.
- b) Yes, it facilitates.
- c) It has a situational effect.
- d) It has no effect at all.

11. For what purpose do the students use Arabic in the English classes?

- a) To ask question.
- b) To give answers.
- c) To deny speaking.
- d) To explain my own problem.

12. How often do the students feel the teacher should use Arabic?

- a) Very often.
- b) Occasionally.
- c) Rarely.
- d) When the situation demands.

13. Who need to use the Arabic in the English class?

- a) Teachers.
- b) Students.
- c) Both.
- d) None.

14. Why do the students need to speak in Arabic while they are in the English classes?

- a) Because of their cultural background.
- b) Because of learning environment.
- c) Because of the influence of the mother tongue.
- b) All the above.

15. In which cases do teachers need to speak in Arabic?

- a) When the teacher is not familiar with English culture.
- b) When the teacher is not familiar with Arabic culture.
- c) When the teacher wants to teach by comparing two languages.
- d) When the teacher is not competent in the target language.

16. How do you feel about taking all classes in English?

- a) Agree.
- b) Disagree.
- c) Interesting.
- d) Not interesting.

17. The use of Arabic in the English classes had a negative impact on the student because

- a) It does not develop the listening skill for English language.
- b) It does not develop the speaking skill for English language.
- c) It does not develop the writing skill for English language.
- d) It does not develop the reading skill for English language.

18. When my teacher uses Arabic in the English class it helps me to

- a) Understand my homework.
- b) Thanks my teacher for his\her help for me.
- c) To know the format of the upcoming test.
- d) Show what type of problems that I face in the material.

إستبانة الطلاب

عزيزي الطالب/الطالبة:

أنا الباحثة مريم النعيمات/ طالبة في قسم الدراسات العليا في جامعة الشرق الأوسط. أقوم الآن بدراسة تتعلق في تعليم اللغة الانجليزية عامة واستعمال اللغة العربية إلى جانب اللغة الانجليزية في حصة اللغة الانجليزية. أرجو منكم تعبئة الاستبانة التالية بكل دقة وأمانة وأشكركم سلفا على تعاونكم علما أن إجاباتكم ستستخدم لأموال البحث العلمي.

اسم المدرسة: _____

الصف: _____

أرجو اختيار الإجابة التي تناسبك:

1. هل يستعمل المعلم أو المعلمة اللغتين العربية والانجليزية في حصة اللغة الانجليزية؟

(أ) نعم (ب) لا

2. ما مدى الوقت الذي يقضيه المعلم/المعلمة باستخدام هذا الأسلوب؟

(أ) غالبا. (ب) أحيانا.
(ج) نادرا. (د) من وقت لآخر.

3. إذا كان المعلم/المعلمة يستخدم/تستخدم هذا الأسلوب، فما السبب برأيك؟

(أ) لان المعلم / المعلمة غير متمكن من اللغة الانجليزية. أو لديه/ها ضعف في اللغة الانجليزية.
(ب) من السهل عليه/ها أن يشرح الدرس باللغة الانجليزية.
(ج) من أجل فهم الطلاب.
(د) لأنه/ها تستمتع عند استخدام اللغة العربية.

4. إذا كان السبب مرتبطا بالمفردات، فأى نوع من المفردات يتطلب ذلك؟

(أ) الكلمات التي تدل على أشياء ملموسة (ب) الكلمات المجردة.
(ج) الكلمات الأدبية. (د) الكلمات الفنية/التقنية.

5. إذا كانت المفردات تدل على أفكار مجردة، فأى نوع منها يدعو لاستخدام اللغة العربية؟

- (أ) الدينية.
(ب) الثقافية.
(ج) العامة.
(د) الجغرافية.

6. إذا كانت الكلمات متعلقة بكلمات ملموسة فهل تعود الى؟

- (أ) أسماء مؤسسات.
(ب) أسماء حيوانات ونباتات.
(ج) أسماء السلع.
(د) أسماء وسائل النقل.

7. ما هي النصوص التي تتطلب استخدام اللغة العربية في شرحها؟

- (أ) التي تحتوي على مفردات صعبة.
(ب) التي تقدم قصة معقدة.
(ج) التي تصف حقل معين من حقول المعرفة.
(د) التي لا علاقة لها بالثقافة العربية.

8. لماذا استعمال اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الانجليزية أمر ضروري؟

- (أ) لإعطاء معنى.
(ب) لفتح باب النقاش.
(ج) لتشجيع الطلبة على الحديث والإدلاء بأرائهم.
(د) لشرح القواعد.

9. برأيك، ما نتيجة الاستخدام المستمر من قبل المعلم/المعلمة للغة العربية أثناء تدريس اللغة الانجليزية؟

- (أ) يساعدني على التعلم.
(ب) يساعدني على اكتساب المعرفة باللغتين (العربية والانجليزية).
(ج) يعرقل عملية تعلمي للغة الانجليزية.
(د) يعرقل عملية تعلمي للغة العربية.

10. هل استعمال اللغة العربية في حصة اللغة الانجليزية يساعد في تسهيل عملية التعلم؟

- (أ) نعم يساعد.
(ب) لا يساعد.
(ج) لا تأثير له.
(د) له تأثير زمني محدد.

11. ما هدفك عزيزي الطالب/الطالبة من استخدام اللغة العربية أثناء حصة اللغة الانجليزية؟

- (أ) لطرح الأسئلة.
(ب) لإعطاء الأجوبة.
(ج) لإظهار عدم الرغبة بالتحدث.
(د) لشرح مشكلتي الخاصة.

12. برأيك، كم من الوقت يحتاج معلمك/معلمتك لاستخدام اللغة العربية أثناء تدريس اللغة الانجليزية؟

- (أ) غالباً.
(ب) من وقت لآخر.
(ج) نادراً.
(د) عندما يتطلب الموقف ذلك.

13. هل استخدام هذا الأسلوب بالتنقل من اللغة الانجليزية الى العربية يعبر عن حاجة الطالب ام المعلم؟

- (أ) المعلم.
(ب) الطالب.
(ج) الاثنان معا.
(د) لا احد.

14. ما حاجة الطالب الى استخدام اللغة العربية اثناء حصة اللغة الانجليزية؟

- (أ) بسبب الحاجة للخلفية الثقافية للغة الانجليزية.
(ب) بسبب البيئة التعليمية التي تفرض استخدام اللغتين.
(ج) بسبب تأثير اللغة الام (العربية).
(د) كل ما ذكر.

15. في اي من المواقف التالية يحتاج المعلم\المعلمة الى استخدام اللغة العربية اثناء تدريس اللغة الانجليزية؟

- (أ) عندما لا يكون على اطلاع كاف في الثقافة الانجليزية.
(ب) عندما لا يكون على اطلاع كاف في الثقافة العربية.
(ج) عندما يقوم بالتدريس من خلال مقارنة اللغتين العربية والانجليزية ببعضهما البعض.
(د) عندما لا يتمكن المعلم\المعلمة من اللغة الانجليزية بشكل ممتاز.

16. ما رايك بان تدرّس جميع المواد الدراسية باللغة الانجليزية؟

- (أ) أوافق على ذلك.
(ب) لا أوافق على ذلك.
(ج) ممتع.
(د) غير ممتع لأنه إلزامي.

17. استخدام المعلم\المعلمة للغة العربية في حصة اللغة الانجليزية له تأثير سلبي على الطالب لأنه:

- (أ) لا يؤدي إلى تطوير مهارة الاستماع لدي باللغة الانجليزية.
(ب) لا يؤدي إلى تطوير مهارة التحدث لدي باللغة الانجليزية.
(ج) لا يؤدي إلى تطوير مهارة الكتابة لدي باللغة الانجليزية.
(د) لا يؤدي إلى تطوير مهارة القراءة لدي باللغة الانجليزية.

18. استخدام معلمي للغة العربية في حصة اللغة الانجليزية يساعدني على:

- (أ) تأكدي من فهم الواجب البيتي.
(ب) شكري لمعلمي\المعلمتي على مساعدته\ها لي.

ج) معرفتي لمحتوى الامتحان.
د) توضيح ما واجهه من مشاكل في فهم الدرس.

Appendix G Schools

School Name	TVT	MT	FVT	T\S\S	Scientific	Literary	IT	M\S	F\S
1. Sheek Shohada' Omar Moktar	3	1	2	34	15	19		20	14
2. Zahra'a Ahleya	4	3	1	26	26			13	13
3. Jawhara	2		2	35	13	17	5	12	23
4. Reyadeya (girls)	2		2	37	11	20	6		37
5. Dur Manthor	5		5	70	39	31			70
6. Nokba (girls)	2		2	33	21	12			33
7. Asreya	3	3		41	17	14	10	23	18
8. Redwan	2		2	27	17	10			27
9. Abed Hameed Sharaf	4	3	1	44	20	24		18	26
10. Safwa	2	1	1	32	15	11	6	14	18
11. Philadelphia	3	2	1	65	25	32	17	31	34
12. Qema (girls)	2	1	1	55	23	20	12	29	26
13. Prince Hamzah Bin Hussein	3		3	36	12	12	12	27	9
14. International (girls)	4	3	1	46	20	26		19	27
15. Iqra'a	2	2		31	21	10		15	16
16. Mashreq	2		2	25	14	11		7	18
17. Ra'ee	4	1	3	59	29	30		35	24
18 Reyadeya (boys)	2	2		40	12	15	13	40	
19. International (boys)	3	2	1	39	20	19		21	18
20. Qema (boys)	2		2	47	12	16	19	24	2
21. Nokba (boys)	3	3		30	19	11		30	
Total	63	28	35	897	426	371	100	399	498

* Key words: TVT→ Total number of Teachers. \ MT→ Male Teachers. \ FVT→ Female Teachers. \ T\S\S→ Total number of First Secondary stage.\ M\S→ Male students. \ F\S→ Female Students.

