

---

## FREQUENCY AND PATTERNS OF LANGUAGE ALTERNATION AND LEVEL OF LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AMONG SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Niña Ericka Mabini

Samar State University, Catbalogan City, Samar, Philippines

<https://doi.org/10.59009/ijllc.2026.0205>

*Received Date:5 June 2026/Published Date:17 July 2026*

---

### ABSTRACT

This study determined the frequency and patterns of language alternation and the level of language proficiency among senior high school students in Wright I District, Schools Division of Samar. Utilizing a quantitative research approach with a descriptive research design, the study included fifty-seven (57) senior high school students selected through stratified random sampling. The data were collected using a validated adapted survey questionnaire, a writing test, and an oral interview. The collected data were analyzed using mean and standard deviation. The results indicated that the student-respondents frequently employ language alternation, particularly by inserting short Filipino or English expressions during discourse. They also regularly used language alternation for clarification, comprehension, identity, affective purposes, and lesson-related concerns. In terms of oral language proficiency, majority of the student-respondents were identified to be at the Intermediate English level (B1), while the written language proficiency is classified to be at the Elementary English (A2) level based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The study suggests that language alternation is a common communicative strategy among senior high school students. Their language proficiency demonstrates the need for further enhancement.

**Keywords:** Language alternation; language proficiency; oral proficiency; writing proficiency; senior high school students

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Language alternation is a manner of switching of language in a single discourse. It is also known as language mixing where a person attempts the use of elements of two languages in the same utterance or in the same stretch of conversation (Paradis, Genesee, & Crago, 2021). Alternating from one language to another has been considered rampant and popular among bilingual and multilingual speakers and has been noted as a strong attribute of informal communication (Garrett, 2010).

In the academe, language learners use language alternation in communicating with their classmates and teachers when having a lesson during their class. The use of language alternation in a language classroom helps aid the struggle of students in understanding the English language (Sampurna, 2023). Code alternation or language alternation can improve students' achievement, attitude, and interest in learning (Olagbaju, Olubunmi, and Oladeji 2024). ESL students preferred the use of code alternation in instructional delivery to the complete use of the English language.

Although alternation of language is a common linguistic outcome in situations of language contact, prevailing ideologies of linguistic purity discredit the practice in most bilingual communities. It is considered a chaotic practice and it is seen by other research linguists as a sign of lack of mastery of either or both languages (Auer, 1998). Additional to this, Fishman (1967), a sociolinguist, states that the practice of language alternation can bring a negative impact to the development of academic and language proficiency of the learners for they lack mastery in both languages. Similarly, Swain (1985) shares that language alternation can limit the students' knowledge on the target language resulting in poor development of higher proficiency in a certain language.

However, based on the study of Suryarini in 2022, the use of language alternation in a classroom is a helpful bridge to students with low proficiency in terms of understanding the learning materials and understanding rules and procedures in the classroom. The findings of the study correspond to the research of Bostanci (2013) that the utilization of language alternation is an essential resource in teaching and learning English. Additionally, language alternation promotes strong comprehension. Myers-Scotton (1993) has the same sentiments about language alternation being an indication of high language proficiency of a student.

On the other hand, the ability to use language appropriately and effectively in written and oral communications in various settings is referred to as language proficiency (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). A framework for understanding language proficiency was developed by Kern (2000) which presents three areas such as linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural aspects of competency in academics. To be considered as proficient, one should have the knowledge and skills in linguistic competence. This needs a strong foundation of knowledge, the capacity to think critically, application of metacognitive, understanding cultural nuances, beliefs, and practices in context. Ultimately, the ability to use the four language domains: speaking, writing, listening, and speaking, appropriately for a range of situations, audiences, and goals is a necessary component of language proficiency.

Proficiency in language is the ability to use the language accurately and effectively. One is proficient in language if he has the ability to spontaneously apply linguistic structures in real-world (Armea et al. 2022). It includes the four macro-skills: listening, speaking, writing, and reading (Richards and Schmidt, 2010) which can be measured through different assessments (Vance, 2021). Bachman & Palmer (1996), Ellis (2008), and Celce-Murcia et. al. (2014) believe that language proficiency is not just about grammatical accuracy but also about having the ability to achieve communicative goals in real-life interactions. Additionally, proficiency in language can significantly contribute to how one uses language in accomplishing communication objectives (ACTFL, 2024). Thus, developing strong language proficiency enables learners to navigate various social and academic contexts more effectively, enhancing both understanding and expression.

A framework of language proficiency across six levels from A1 (beginner) to C2 (proficient) was introduced by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). It highlights the learner's performance encompassing the four macro-skills in various contexts (Council of Europe, 2001). This framework provides a clear structure for assessing and guiding language development, helping both teachers and learners identify strengths and areas for improvement.

Research consistently demonstrates that language proficiency serves as a powerful predictor of academic success. The relationship between language proficiency and student academic performance is highly significant. The study by Wang (2023) assessed the relationship between English language proficiency and academic performance among international accounting students in a transnational program in China. It was revealed that proficiency in English language positively affects the learners' academic performance. This indicates that strong language skills help enhance their understanding of accounting concepts and overall performance. This study of Wang demonstrated the critical role of language proficiency in achieving academic goals. Therefore, fostering language proficiency should be a key focus in educational programs to support both comprehension and overall student achievement.

Most studies on language alternation and language proficiency are conducted on young children and adult language learners leaving a significant gap on learners aging 15-20 years old which are now considered as senior high school students. There is a need for an evidence-based study in determining the frequency and patterns of language alternation and level of language proficiency among senior high school students for they are transitioning to higher education where language proficiency is significant and language alternation is situational. This gap could provide suggestions for updated teaching strategies and highlight the need for interventions to enhance students' writing and speaking communicative competence.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

This study adopted a quantitative method utilizing descriptive research design to determine the frequency and patterns of language alternation and the level of language proficiency among senior high school students. Descriptive research targets to accurately and systematically describe a population, situation or phenomenon (McCombes, 2023). It is used to identify characteristics, frequencies, trends, and categories. The approach was suitable as it allowed the researcher to identify frequency and patterns of language alternation as well as the level of proficiency of senior high school students in oral and written communications.

The study was conducted in Wright I District of Samar, involving fifty-seven (57) senior high school students selected through stratified random sampling to ensure proportional representation across grade levels and strands. Data were collected using a validated adapted survey questionnaire, part of which was based on Olagbaju et al. (2024), and analyzed using descriptive statistical methods. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Research Ethics Review Committee (IRERC), and informed consent was secured from all participants, ensuring voluntary participation and confidentiality.

There are two schools under the Wright I District that offer Senior High School education. School A, a larger institution, which accommodates a diverse student population across multiple academic strands and sections, providing a comprehensive senior high school curriculum. School B is relatively smaller but similarly offers senior high school programs with distinct academic strands. The data gathering was administered inside the school premises during the students' free time and the researcher ensured that classes were not disturbed. The classrooms and schools provided a safe environment for administering the survey, which allowed the student-respondents complete the questionnaire successfully. Conducting the study in these settings enabled the researcher to

observe the students in their natural academic context and ensured smooth coordination with the school personnel for an efficient data-gathering process.

The adapted and validated survey questionnaire the researcher used allowed the collection of statistical data on the characteristics, views, or behaviors of a group by asking standardized questions to a portion or all of its members (Buckingham & Saunders, 2004). The instrument was validated with the professional assistance of experts to ensure its clarity, applicability, and suitability in addressing the research problem.

The items to measure the frequency and patterns of language alternation in the survey questionnaire were rated using a Likert scale with the following guide: Always (3), Rarely (2), and Never (1) with assigned ranges for interpretation: Always (2.34–3.00), Rarely (1.67–2.30), and Never (1.00–1.66). This scale allowed the researcher to systematically quantify the students' use of language alternation.

The students' writing proficiency was measured using a writing test, while their speaking proficiency was assessed through an oral interview. The obtained scores were then classified into proficiency levels—Beginner (A1), Elementary English (A2), Intermediate English (B1), Upper Intermediate English (B2), Advanced English (C1), and Proficient (C2), based on the established scoring guide. Students' proficiency levels in both writing and speaking were identified using the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), an internationally recognized standard that provides clear descriptors for different levels of language competence. This ensured that the evaluation of students' communication skills was standardized, reliable, and comparable across participants.

### **Sampling Procedure**

The researcher used stratified random sampling in identifying the respondents who took part in this study. Stratified random sampling is a method of sampling technique that divides the population into strata that share common characteristics such as grade level and school affiliation. Stratified random sampling is the most suitable method for this study since the respondents came from two (2) Senior High Schools of Wright I district, the locales of the study. A random sample was picked from each stratum with equal allocation to ensure adequate representation. The result will be higher in precision for it responds to population diversity and reduces sampling error (Creswell and Creswell, 2017; Etikan and Bala, 2017).

The target respondents were fifty-seven (57) officially enrolled senior high school students of Wright I District. These fifty-seven (57) officially enrolled SHS students were composed of thirty (30) students from School A and twenty-seven (27) from School B.

The respondents of the study were selected from two senior high school campuses in the Wright I District. These campuses were chosen through purposive sampling due to their accessibility and feasibility for data collection. The inclusion criteria required that participants (1) be officially enrolled as senior high school students during the conduct of the study, (2) be currently attending classes in the selected campuses, and (3) provide informed consent to participate. The student population of these campuses was deemed appropriate as it allowed for a comprehensive assessment of the frequency and patterns of language alternation and levels of language

proficiency. Senior high school students are at a critical transitional stage between secondary and tertiary education. At this level, students are expected to demonstrate higher communicative competence, particularly in speaking and writing. Investigating their frequency and patterns of language alternation and level of language proficiency is essential in determining whether these linguistic practices influence their academic preparedness for college.

### Statistical Treatment of Data

The researcher sought professional assistance from qualified experts to ensure the accuracy, validity, and proper interpretation of the data collected from the student respondents. These professionals, who possess relevant qualifications and experience in linguistics, language assessment, statistics, and data analysis, reviewed, evaluated, and interpreted the data, including written essays, oral interview responses, and the frequency and patterns of language alternation among senior high school students, to ensure that the findings were reliable and accurately represented.

The following descriptive statistical tools were used:

- (1) Mean was used to determine the central tendency of students' language alternation behaviors, showing how often they engaged in specific alternation patterns,
- (2) Standard deviation measured the variability of responses, indicating the consistency of the behaviors.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

#### Frequency and Patterns of Language Alternation

**Table 1. Frequency of Language Alternation among Senior High School Students**

| Indicator                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Mean        | SD   | Interpretation |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------|----------------|
| 1. I alternate from one language to another between sentences when speaking. Example: <i>Nakakapagod and araw na ito. I deserve a long rest.</i>                                                                      | 2.43        | 0.49 | Always         |
| 2. I mix words from different languages within the same sentence. Example: <i>This day is sobrang nakakapagod.</i>                                                                                                    | 2.43        | 0.53 | Always         |
| 3. I add short Filipino words, expressions like "po", "diba", or "ano" when speaking English, or I add short English words like "you know" or "yeah" when speaking Filipino. Example: <i>I am so pagod, you know.</i> | 2.55        | 0.53 | Always         |
| 4. I use both English and Filipino when writing class notes or assignments.                                                                                                                                           | 2.27        | 0.49 | Rarely         |
| 5. I alternate languages depending on who I am talking to (e.g., teacher vs. classmates)                                                                                                                              | 2.52        | 0.43 | Always         |
| <b>Mean</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>2.44</b> |      | <b>Always</b>  |
| <b>SD</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                             | <b>0.11</b> |      |                |

Legend:      1.00 – 1.66      Never  
                   1.67 – 2.30      Rarely  
                   2.34 – 3.00      Always

Table 1 presents the frequency of language alternation of senior high school student-respondents. Showing a weighted mean of 2.44 with a standard deviation of 0.11 indicating that the student-respondents use language alternation frequently. This implies that language alternation is a common practice among senior high school students.

The highest mean (2.55) with standard deviation of 0.53 was obtained from statement no. 3 which states that “I add short Filipino words expressions like “po,” “diba,” or “ano” when speaking English or I add short expressions English words like “you know,” or “yeah” when speaking Filipino. This indicates that inserting short expressions from another language is the most frequent form of language alternation among the respondents.

Meanwhile, the indicator “I use both English and Filipino when writing class notes or assignments has the lowest mean of (2.27) with a standard deviation of (0.49) falls under “rarely.” This suggests that respondents are less likely to alternate languages in written academic tasks compared to oral communication.

The results suggest that language alternation is more frequent in informal and spoken communication than in written forms. This is because students’ technique of using more than one language to produce and create an interactive discourse. The studies of Kamal and Roy (2024) and Zahiro et al. (2024) align with these results where language alternation is frequent and effective in illustrating meaning and interacting with peers. On the other hand, in written contexts, language alternation is lesser due to formal language norms (Estremera and Gilbas, 2022).

**Table 2. Patterns of Language Alternation among Senior High School**

| Indicator                                                                                                                            | Mean        | SD   | Interpretation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------|----------------|
| 1. I alternate to other language (Filipino or Mother tongue) when I struggle to explain my idea in English. ( <i>Clarification</i> ) | 2.52        | 0.50 | Always         |
| 2. I alternate languages to make and help my classmates understand better. ( <i>Comprehension</i> )                                  | 2.46        | 0.57 | Always         |
| 3. I alternate to English when I like to appear formal or confident. ( <i>Identity/Formality</i> )                                   | 2.46        | 0.50 | Always         |
| 4. I alternate to Filipino (or mother tongue) when I feel shy or nervous using English. ( <i>Affective</i> )                         | 2.66        | 0.47 | Always         |
| 5. I alternate languages when the subject matter is difficult. ( <i>Lesson-concerns</i> )                                            | 2.57        | 0.53 | Always         |
| <b>Mean</b>                                                                                                                          | <b>2.53</b> |      | <b>Always</b>  |
| <b>SD</b>                                                                                                                            | <b>0.08</b> |      |                |
| <i>Legend:</i> 1.00 – 1.66      Never<br>1.67 – 2.30      Rarely<br>2.34 – 3.00      Always                                          |             |      |                |

Table 2 presents the patterns of language alternation among senior high school students. The results indicate that all indicators fall within the range of 2.34 – 3.00 which clearly states that students always apply language alternation in various communicative situations.

Of all the indicators, alternating from English language to Filipino language or mother tongue when feeling nervous or shy has the highest mean ( $M = 2.66$ ,  $SD = 0.47$ ). This shows that students' language choice is influenced by affective factors. When experiencing anxiety or lack of confidence, students tend to revert to their more comfortable language.

Findings show that students consistently alternated languages when dealing with difficult subject matter ( $M = 2.57$ ,  $SD = 0.53$ ) and when struggling to explain ideas in English ( $M = 2.52$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ). The results indicate that language alternation is used as a technique for clarification and lesson-concerns. Students use their first language as a cognitive tool to facilitate understanding and expression.

In addition, it was observed that students resort to language alternation to enhance understanding ( $M = 2.46$ ,  $SD = 0.57$ ) and to show that they appear confident and formal by switching to English language ( $M = 2.46$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ). This indicates that language alternation is not only compensatory but also strategic. Students consciously shift languages depending on social and communicative purposes.

Generally, the findings suggest that language alternation among senior high school students is a common strategy for effective communication. It functions as an approach to clarification, comprehension, identity, formality, and affective purposes in classroom interactions. Similar research studies (Matin and Rozak, 2026; Juhairi and Sudrajad, 2025; Gamelo and Raymundo Roy, 2024) show that students use language alternation to clarify meaning, engage with peers, and respond to linguistic and cultural needs in a classroom setting.

### Level of Proficiency of Students in Oral and Written Communications

**Table 3. Oral Proficiency Level of Senior High School Students**

| Proficiency Level in Speaking   | No. of Students | Percent                   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| 3 - 4 Intermediate English (B1) | 4               | 7.0                       |
| 2 Elementary English (A2)       | 52              | 91.2                      |
| 0 - 1 Beginner (A1)             | 1               | 1.8                       |
| Total                           | 57              | 100.0                     |
| Mean                            | 3.25            | Intermediate English (B1) |
| SD                              | 0.65            |                           |

|                |        |                                        |
|----------------|--------|----------------------------------------|
| <i>Legend:</i> | 0 – 1  | <i>Beginner (A1)</i>                   |
|                | 2      | <i>Elementary English (A2)</i>         |
|                | 3 – 4  | <i>Intermediate English (B1)</i>       |
|                | 5 – 6  | <i>Upper Intermediate English (B2)</i> |
|                | 7 – 8  | <i>Advanced English (C1)</i>           |
|                | 9 – 10 | <i>Proficient (C2)</i>                 |

Table 3 shows the oral proficiency levels of the fifty-seven student-respondents. Most students (52 or 91.2%) are classified under Elementary English (A2), 4 students (7.0%) fall within Intermediate English (B1), and 1 student (1.8%) is a beginner. The average mean of 3.25 corresponds to Intermediate English (B1) but shows a strong leaning toward Elementary English (A2). According to the CEFR (2001), learners at the Intermediate level (B1) can understand the main points of clear speech on familiar topics and produce connected speech to describe experiences or express opinions (British Council). The leaning toward Elementary English may reflect limited practice, exposure outside the classroom, or varying confidence in speaking, indicating that further practice is needed to strengthen fluency and independence.

The findings of the study recommend the need for intervention to enhance the oral skills of the students. Most of the student-respondents fall in the Elementary English level (A2), significantly lower than their current grade level, may be given additional speaking exercises, activities that requires oral conversation, and utilizing the English language even outside the classroom to help improve their oral proficiency level. This aligns to the teaching principle of Prabhu (1987) and Willis (1996), the second language pedagogy and task-based learning. This also correlates to the studies of Detken et al. (2024) and Zhang (2025) suggesting that structured and active oral practice can effectively elevate students' oral proficiency level.

**Table 4. Written Proficiency Level of Senior High School Students**

| Proficiency Level in Writing  | No. of Students | Percent                 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 3 - 5 Elementary English (A2) | 55              | 96.5                    |
| 0 - 2 Beginner (A1)           | 2               | 3.5                     |
| Total                         | 57              | 100.0                   |
| Mean                          | 3.60            | Elementary English (A2) |
| SD                            | 0.79            |                         |

|                |         |                                        |
|----------------|---------|----------------------------------------|
| <i>Legend:</i> | 0 – 2   | <i>Beginner (A1)</i>                   |
|                | 3 – 5   | <i>Elementary English (A2)</i>         |
|                | 6 – 7   | <i>Intermediate English (B1)</i>       |
|                | 8 – 10  | <i>Upper Intermediate English (B2)</i> |
|                | 11 – 12 | <i>Advanced English (C1)</i>           |
|                | 13 – 15 | <i>Proficient (C2)</i>                 |

Table 4 presents the writing proficiency levels of the senior high school student-respondents. Most students (55 out of 57, or 96.5%) are classified under Elementary English (A2), while two students (3.5%) are categorized as Beginners (B1). The mean score of 3.60 indicates that the overall writing proficiency of the group is within the elementary range, and the standard deviation of 0.79 shows that the students' scores are relatively consistent. According to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR, 2001), learners at the

Elementary level can write simple sentences and short texts on familiar topics, demonstrating basic writing skills typical of senior high school students, though further practice is needed to develop more complex expression.

The findings show that the writing ability of the students remains at the Elementary English (A2) level, despite them being at the highest and last grade level of basic education. This calls for a need of writing intervention for senior high school students in developing their writing proficiency skills in terms of organization, grammar structure, vocabulary use, and coherence. More opportunities of writing activities of various concepts may help elevate their skills gradually. Strengthening writing instruction may help learners progress beyond the elementary level and achieve greater linguistic competence.

Various researches support that well-designed writing instructions and peer engagements can significantly improve students' paragraph organization and vocabulary use (Delis, 2025). Similarly, Ochoa's (2024) study revealed that writing competence is an indicator of writing performance, and that if various strategies and activities are employed for writing skill development, enhanced overall writing skill can be achieved.

The study concluded that senior high school students frequently employ language alternation as they communicate inside the classroom and insert short utterances from other languages. This is done for various purposes such as for clarification, comprehension, emotional expression, identity, and for lesson-concerns. Language alternation is viewed as beneficial tool and cognitive approach in classroom interactions. It is recommended that teachers may facilitate students in the deliberate use of language alternation during classroom interactions as it substantiates clarification, comprehension, and expressions while highlighting the utilization of the target language in the academic settings.

The students' oral proficiency level is identified to be at Intermediate English (B1) while their written proficiency level is to be at Elementary English (A2). This suggests a need for strategic interventions designed to improve their writing and speaking proficiency levels. Schools may implement structured writing and speaking activities to enhance both written and oral proficiency with emphasis on strengthening the fundamental skills to facilitate students' progress from Elementary English level proficiency.

Future studies may explore additional factors affecting language proficiency, such as language exposure, motivation, or instructional approaches and may analyze the enduring effectiveness of structured writing and speaking activities designed for learners with Intermediate (B1) and Elementary English (A2) levels.

## REFERENCES

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2024). ACTFL proficiency guidelines 2024.
- Armea, A., Castro, M., Llamado, M., Lotino, R., San Esteban, A., Ocampo. (2022). English proficiency and literacy competence of English major students: Predictor for effective language and literature teaching. *Globus Journal of Progressive Education*, 12(1) 141.
- Auer, P. (1998). *Code-Switching in conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. Routledge.

- Bachman, L.F., and Palmer, A.S. (1996) *Language Testing in Practice: Designing and Developing Useful Language Tests*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bostancı, H. B., & Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2013). Reasons for the teachers' uses of code-switching in adult EFL classrooms. *Hasan Âli Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(2), 69–82.
- Buckingham, A., & Saunders, P. (2004). *The survey methods workbook: From design to analysis*. Polity.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Snow, M. A. (2018). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed.). National Geographic Learning.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. V. (2000). *Dual Language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Medical Entomology and Zoology. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA46630102>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume with new descriptors*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Detken, M. B., Ramirez-Avila, M. R., & Chancay, C. H. (2024). Task-based activities to improve oral communication skills in adult learners. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 9(1), 41–59. <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.v9i1.19381>
- Delis, M. F. (2025). Enhancing the academic writing abilities of senior high school students in English for academic and professional purposes. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*, 11(9). <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra2013>
- Ellis, R. (2008b). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Estremera, M., & Gilbas, S. (2022). Written and oral codeswitching prevalence: Functions and didactic implications in esl context. *Advanced Education*, 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.257173>
- Etikan, I., & Bala, K. (2017). Sampling and sampling methods. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, 5(6), 215–217. DOI:10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149
- European Commission. (2007). *Report on the implementation of the Action Plan “Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity”*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A52007DC0554>
- Fishman, J. A. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; Diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2), 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1967.tb00573.x>
- Gamelo, L., & Roy, J. L. R. (2024). Code-switching practices of junior high school teachers and learners in English as second language (ESL) classes: Basis in Designing Intervention Program. *International Journal of Linguistics Literature & Translation*, 7(7), 75–92. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2024.7.7.9>
- Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Juhairi, I., & Sudrajad, W. (2022). Exploring the role of code switching in bilingual classroom interactions. *At Ta'lim : Jurnal Pendidikan*, 8(2), 213–218. <https://doi.org/10.55210/attalim.v8i2.1836>
- Kamal, C. A., & Roy, S. (2024). Code-switching and code-mixing during speaking among tertiary level learners in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VIII(IV), 457–466. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.804035>
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. In *Medical Entomology and Zoology*. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA49493879>

- Matin, M. F., & Rozak, R. R. (2026). Code switching and code mixing used by students in an English classroom. *Academy of Education Journal*, 17(1), 153–161. <https://doi.org/10.47200/aoej.v17i1.3408>
- McCombes, S. (2023, June 22). Descriptive Research | Definition, Types, Methods & Examples. Scribbr. Retrieved July 3, 2026, from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/descriptive-research/>
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford University Press.
- Ochoa, N. C. (2025). Examining the Influence of Writing Anxiety and Writing Efficacy to English Writing Skills among Senior High School Students: Basis for a Writing Intervention Program. *Diversitas Journal*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.48017/dj.v10i2.3262>
- Olagbaju, O. O., Olubunmi, B. R., & Oladeji, O. O. (2024). Code alternation in English as a second language classroom: A communication and learning strategy. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4738557>
- Paradis, J., Genesee, F., & Crago, M. (2021). *Dual Language development and disorders* (3rd ed.). Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co. [https://brookespublishing.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Paradis-3e\\_First-page-proofs-excerpt.pdf](https://brookespublishing.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Paradis-3e_First-page-proofs-excerpt.pdf)
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Schidmt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Longman.
- Sampurna, B. (2023). Code-switching in English classroom. *Jurnal Syntax Transformation*, 4(2721–3854). <https://doi.org/10.46799/jst.v4i3.706>
- Suryarini, D. Y. (2022). The use of Code-Switching in English as a foreign language classrooms in teacher's perspective. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(5), 8458–8465. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i5.3867>
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
- Vance, N. (2021). Four language skills. EBSCO Research Starters.
- Wang, H., Schultz, J. L., & Huang, Z. (2023). English language proficiency, prior knowledge, and student success in an international Chinese accounting program. *Heliyon*, 9(8), e18596. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e18596>
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.
- Zahiroh, M., Setyono, B., & Sukmaantara, I. P. (2024). A narrative study of pre-service English teachers' perspective on code-switching activities in their speaking class. *International Journal of Qualitative Research*, 4(2), 105–110. <https://doi.org/10.47540/ijqr.v4i2.1422>
- Zhang, X. (2025). Enhancing oral English learning through AI: a case study on the impact of AI-driven speaking applications among Chinese university students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1595818. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1595818>