

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE (ENGLISH)

Examining the Effect of Teacher's Code-Switching on Students' Writing Performance in English Language Classroom: the Case of Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha Campus, Ethiopia

By
Markos Medhin Mekuria

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
April 2026

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

Examining the Effect of Teacher's Code-Switching on Students' Writing Performance in English Language Classroom: the Case of Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha Campus, Ethiopia

By: Markos Medhin Mekuria (GSR/4248/11)

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature (English)

Adviser:
Nuru Mohammed (PhD, Associate professor)

A Thesis submitted to the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature in Fulfilment of the Degree of Philosophy in English Language Teaching

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
April 2026

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this dissertation is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all sources of materials used for the dissertation have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Markos Medhin Mekuria

Signature: _____

Place: Department of Foreign Languages and Literature (English), Addis Ababa University

Date of Submission: _____

Approval Page

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE (ENGLISH)

Examining the Effect of Teacher's Code-Switching on Students' Writing Performance in English Language Classroom: the Case of Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha Campus, Ethiopia

By: Markos Medhin Mekuria

A Thesis submitted to the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature in Fulfilment of the Degree of Philosophy in English Language Teaching

Approved by the Board of Examiners

Advisor	Signature	Date
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date
External Examiner	Signature	Date

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effect of code-switching on students' writing performance in English language classrooms using a quasi-experimental research design, situated within a pragmatic paradigm and guided by a mixed-methods approach. The study was further informed by principles of Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT), which emphasize the value of learners' linguistic and cultural resources in the instructional process. Data were collected through pretests, posttests, and teacher interviews. Thirty-three undergraduate students majoring in Dawro Doonaa were assigned to two groups based on pretest results: a control group received instruction exclusively in English, while an experimental group was taught through a code-switching approach that incorporated students' first language (L1). The participants were third-year students enrolled in an Advanced Composition in English course. Writing performance was assessed at sentence, paragraph, and essay levels, and qualitative data were gathered from two instructors regarding their perspectives on L1 use in instruction. It should be noted that the relatively small sample size constitutes a limitation of the study and may affect the generalizability of the findings. Quantitative analysis using SPSS version 26 revealed no statistically significant differences between the two instructional approaches across key writing dimensions, including grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity. Although minor variations were observed—such as slightly higher mean scores for the code-switching group in grammatical accuracy and for the English-only group in idea development and clarity—these differences were not statistically meaningful. Likewise, no significant variation was found across writing levels, indicating that task complexity, rather than instructional language, was the primary factor influencing student performance. The qualitative findings from teacher interviews indicated that code-switching is perceived as a practical and context-sensitive strategy that supports comprehension, reduces learner anxiety, and enhances confidence, particularly among lower-proficiency students. While these perceptions are consistent with CRT principles, the quantitative results suggest that such benefits do not translate into measurable differences in writing performance. Overall, the findings indicate that both code-switching and English-only instruction can produce comparable outcomes when effectively implemented, with writing performance being influenced more by pedagogical practices, learner characteristics, and task demands than by the instructional language itself. Based on these findings, it is recommended that educators adopt a flexible and learner-centered approach to instruction. In multilingual classrooms, the strategic and limited use of code-switching may be employed to support comprehension and engagement, while maintaining sustained exposure to English to promote the development of academic writing skills.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During my PhD studies, I endured some of the most difficult periods of my life, including severe nosebleeds that resulted in two hospitalizations and a prolonged recovery, as well as a challenging battle with COVID-19 that affected my entire family. I am deeply grateful to God for sustaining me through these trials and enabling me to complete this journey.

I would like to thank my adviser, Dr. Nuru Mohammed (Associate Professor), for the constructive comments and insightful guidance he has provided.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the campus dean, the vice dean for academic affairs, the head of Department of English Language and Literature, the head of Dawrootsuwa Language and Literature, the Advanced Composition in English course instructor, and the third year Dawrootsuwa Language and Literature students of Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha Campus (WSUDTC) for their vital cooperation.

Finally, I am thankful to my family that has become source of energy to me whenever I needed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS iii
LIST OF TABLES x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xii
LIST OF PUBLISHED ARTICLES xiii
LIST OF APPENDICES xiv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 Background of the Study 1
1.2 Statement of the Problem 4
1.3 Research Objectives 5
1.4 Research Questions 6
1.5 Research Hypotheses 7
1.6 Theoretical Framework 8
1.7 Significance of the Study 10
1.8 Delimitation of the Study 10
1.9 Organization of the Dissertation 11
1.10 Limitations of the Study 11
1.11 Definition of Key Terms 11
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 13
2.1 The Nature of Writing 13
2.2 The Development of Writing 15
2.2.1 The history of teaching writing 16
2.2.1.1 The shift to process-oriented approaches 17
2.2.1.2 Contextual and disciplinary focus 18
2.2.1.3 Recent developments in writing pedagogy 19
2.2.2 Factors affecting writing skills development 19
2.2.2.1 Cognitive factors 20

2.2.2.2 Educational influences 20
2.2.2.3 Social and cultural factors 21
2.2.2.4 Environmental and technological factors 22
2.2.3 Language proficiency and writing development 23
2.2.3.1 Influence of L1 24
2.2.3.2 Stages of L2 writing development 24
2.2.3.3 Cognitive and linguistic challenges in L2 writing 25
2.2.3.4 Academic vs. conversational language acquisition (Cummins' BICS and CALP) 26
2.3 Integration of Language Skills 27
2.3.1 Writing and listening 27
2.3.2 Writing and speaking 28
2.3.3 Writing and reading 29
2.3.4 Comprehensive integration of skills 29
2.3.5 Benefits of skill integration 30
2.4 Assessment of Writing Performance 30
2.4.1 Methods for measuring writing performance 31
2.4.2 How code-switching may complicate assessment 31
2.4.3 Standardized testing vs. authentic writing tasks 32
2.4.4 Writing skills tests 33
2.4.4.1. Proficiency tests 34
2.4.4.2 Achievement tests 34
2.4.4.3 Diagnostic tests 35
2.4.4.4 Placement tests 36
2.4.5 Approaches to scoring writing tests 37
2.4.5.1 Error-count approach 37
2.4.5.2 Analytic approach 38
2.4.5.3 Holistic approach 39
2.5 Code-Switching: Definitions and Typologies 40
2.5.1 Definition of code-switching 40
2.5.2 Typologies of code-switching 41

2.6 Code-Switching, Code-Mixing, Translation, L1 Use, and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts 43
2.6.1 Code-Switching 43
2.6.2 Code-Mixing 45
2.6.3 Translation 45
2.6.4 L1 use in multilingual contexts 46
2.6.5 Code-Switching and Translanguaging 47
2.6.6 Comparative analysis 49
2.7 Theoretical Frameworks of Code-Switching 50
2.8 Reasons for Using L1 in L2 Classrooms 53
2.8.1 Naturalness and comfort in communication 53
2.8.2 Ease of communication and effectiveness 54
2.8.3 Reducing emotional load 54
2.8.4 Social and educational context 55
2.8.5 Cognitive processing and L2 learning 55
2.9 The Role of L1 in L2 Classrooms 56
2.9.1 Theoretical perspectives and the foreign language classroom 56
2.9.2 Affective and emotional dimensions 56
2.9.3 Cognitive and instructional benefits 57
2.9.4 Vocabulary acquisition and code-switching 57
2.9.5 Classroom management and instructional clarity 58
2.9.6 Contextual factors and instructional balance 58
2.9.7 Risks of overusing the L1 59
2.10 Impacts of Code-Switching on Writing Performance 60
2.10.1 Empirical studies on the impact of code-switching on writing skills 60
2.10.2 Differences between monolingual and bilingual writers 61
2.10.3 Short-term vs. long-term effects of code-switching 61
2.10.4 Impact on accuracy, fluency, and complexity 62
2.11 Extent of L1 Use in L2 Classrooms 63
2.11.1 Theoretical perspectives on L1 use in L2 education 63
2.11.2 Empirical evidence on L1 use in the classroom 64

2.11.3 Learners' proficiency and L1 use 64
2.11.4 Teacher-driven use of L1 65
2.11.5 Student preferences and attitudes towards L1 use 65
2.12 Comparative Studies and Global Perspectives on Code-Switching in Writing 66
2.12.1 Case studies from different countries (ESL vs. EFL contexts) 66
2.12.2 Comparative analysis of code-switching in rural vs. urban schools 67
2.12.3 Influence of dominant language policies in multilingual countries 68
2.13 Sociocultural and Contextual Influences on Code-Switching and Writing Performance. 69
2.13.1 Cultural identity and language use 69
2.13.2 Language attitudes and their impact on writing confidence 70
2.13.3 Influence of community and family language practices 71
2.14 Student and Teacher Perspectives on Code-Switching in the English Classroom 72
2.14.1 Qualitative insights into student experiences with code-switching 72
2.14.2 Teacher strategies for integrating or discouraging code-switching 73
2.14.3 Classroom interaction patterns involving code-switching 73
2.15 Gaps in the Literature on Code-Switching and Writing Performance 74
2.15.1 Under-researched student groups 75
2.15.2 Lack of longitudinal studies 75
2.15.3 Need for more mixed-methods and corpus-based approaches 76
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY 77
3.1 Study Design 77
3.2 Study Setting and Context 78
3.3 Participants and Selection Techniques 79
3.3.1 Selection of participant teachers 80
3.3.2 Selection of participant students 81
3.4 Data Collection Tools 83
3.4.1 The pre-test 83
3.4.2 The post-test 84
3.4.3 Interview 86
3.5 Data Collection Procedure 87
3.6 Experimental Conditions and Implementation Fidelity Monitoring 89

3.7 Materials 91
3.7.1 Instructional materials 91
3.7.2 Rubrics 93
3.7.3 Theoretical Justification for Rubric Dimensions 94
3.8 Inter-Rater Reliability 96
3.9 Data Analysis 97
3.9.1 Analysis of Quantitative Data 97
3.9.2 Qualitative Data Analysis: Thematic Analysis Procedures 99
3.10 Addressing Ethical Issues 102
3.11 Analysis and Discussion of the Pilot Study Results, Summary of the Findings, and Lessons Learned from the Pilot Study 102
3.11.1 Participant grouping 102
3.11.2 Biographical information about the participants 104
3.11.3 Effect of instructional types on students' sentence writing performance 104
3.11.3.1 Comparison of mean scores of students' writing performance on features of writing between groups 105
3.11.3.1.1 Comparison of mean of students' writing performance on language as a feature of writing between the groups 106
3.11.3.1.2 Comparison of mean of students' writing performance on structure as a feature of writing between the groups 107
3.11.3.2 Comparison of mean of students' overall sentence writing performance (SWP) between groups 108
3.11.4 Effect of instructional types on students' paragraph writing performance 109
3.11.4.1 Comparison of mean scores of students' writing performance on paragraph-level features between groups 109
3.11.4.1.1 Comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance (PWP) on language as a feature of writing (LFW) between the groups 110
3.11.4.1.2 Comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance (PWP) on structure as a feature of writing (SFW) between the groups 111
3.11.4.1.3 Comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance (PWP) on idea development as a feature of writing (IDFW) between the groups 112

3.11.4.1.4 Comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance (PWP) on explicitness as a feature of writing (EFW) between the groups 113
3.11.4.2 Comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance (PWP) between the groups 115
3.11.5 Effect of instructional types on students' essay writing performance 116
3.11.5.1 Comparison of mean essay writing performance (EWP) on features of writing between groups 116
3.11.5.1.1 Comparison of mean of students' essay writing performance (EWP) on language as a feature of writing (LFW) between the groups 117
3.11.5.1.2 Comparison of mean of students' essay writing performance (EWP) on structure as a feature of writing (SFW) between the groups 118
3.11.5.1.3 Comparison of mean of students' essay writing performance (EWP) on idea development as a feature of writing (IDFW) between the groups 119
3.11.5.1.4 Comparison of mean of students' essay writing performance (EWP) on explicitness as a feature of writing (EFW) between the groups 120
3.11.5.2 Comparison of mean of students' essay writing performance (EWP) between the groups 121
3.11.6 Comparison of students' writing performance within levels of writing between groups 122
3.11.7 Comparison within features of writing in WP between groups 124
3.11.8 The comparison of overall performance in writing 125
3.11.9 Analysis of data gathered from interview 126
3.11.10 Summary of Findings 129
3.11.11 Lessons learned from the pilot study 131
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS 133
4.1 The Pretest Results 134
4.2 The Results of Main Experiment 135
4.2.1 Comparison of students' grammatical accuracy in posttest writing 135
4.2.2 Comparison of students' structural coherence in posttest 138
4.2.3 Comparison of students' posttest performance in idea development and organizational skills 140

4.2.4 Comparison of students' posttest performance in Explicitness 142
4.2.5 Comparison of students' writing performance across features of writing between groups 144
4.2.6 Comparison of students' writing performance across levels of writing between groups 152
4.2.7 The comparison of the students' overall performance in writing 159
4.3 Teachers' Perception on Role of Code-Switching on Students' Language Learning 161
4.4 The Comparison of the Findings of Main Study and the Pilot Study 164
4.5 The Connection among the Findings, the CRT Theory and the Policy 166
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION 169
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 181
6.1 Conclusion 181
6.2 Recommendations 183
REFERENCES 1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: The pretest results between groups 103
Table 3.2 Comparison of performance on language features (LFW) between groups 106
Table 3.3: Comparison of performance on structure features between groups..... 107
Table 3.4 Differences in sentence writing performance between EO and CS groups 108
Table 3.5: Comparison of paragraph writing performance on language features (LFW) between groups 110
Table 3.6: Comparison of paragraph writing performance (PWP) on structure features (SFW) between groups.....112
Table 3.7: Comparison of paragraph writing performance (PWP) on Idea development features (IDFW) between groups.....113
Table 3.8: Comparison of paragraph writing performance (PWP) on explicitness features (EFW) between groups.....114
Table 3.9: Differences in paragraph writing performance (PWP) between groups 115
Table 3.10: Comparison of essay writing performance (EWP) on language features (LFW) between groups.....117
Table 3.11: Comparison of essay writing performance (EWP) on structure as feature of writing (SFW) between groups.....118
Table 3.12: Comparison of essay writing performance (EWP) on idea development as feature of writing (IDFW) between groups 119
Table 3.13: Comparison of essay writing performance (EWP) on explicitness as feature of writing (EFW) between groups 120
Table 3.14: Differences in essay writing performance (EWP) between groups 121
Table 3.15: Comparison within levels of writing between groups 123
Table 3.16: Comparison within features of writing in WP between groups 124
Table 3.17: Differences in writing performance (WP) between groups 126
Table 4.1: The pretest results between groups 134
Table 4.2: Comparison of students' writing performance of grammatical accuracy between groups 136
Table 4.3: Comparison of students' writing performance of structure between groups 138

Table 4.4: Comparison of students' writing performance of Idea Development between groups 141
Table 4.5: Comparison of students' writing performance of Explicitness between groups..... 143
Table 4.6: Comparative analysis of students' posttest writing performance across four features of writing 145
Table 4.7: Descriptive Statistics of Writing Performance across Features of Writing..... 146
Table 4.9: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects across Features of Writing 149
Table 4.8: Multivariate Test Results across Features of Writing 147
Table 4.10: Pairwise Comparisons of Writing Features..... 150
Table 4.11: Comparison of average student performance across three levels of writing 152
Table 4.12: Descriptive Statistics of Writing Performance across Levels of Writing..... 155
Table 4.13: Multivariate Test Results across Levels of Writing 156
Table 4.14: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects across Levels of Writing..... 157
Table 4.15: Pairwise Comparisons of Writing Levels 157
Table 4.16: Comparison of the Students' Overall Performance in Writing between groups 159

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Complete/ full form
CRT	Culturally Responsive Teaching
CS	Code-Switching
DTC	Dawro Tarcha Campus
EFW	Explicitness as a feature of writing
EO	English-Only
EOI	English-Only Instruction
EWP	Essay writing performance
FL	Foreign language
IDFW	Idea development as a feature of writing
IT	Instructional Type
IT's	Instructional Types
L1	Students' first language (mother tongue)
L2	Target language (foreign language)
LFW	Language as a feature of writing
PWP	Paragraph writing performance
SFW	Structure as a feature of writing
SL	Second language
SLA	Second language acquisition
SWP	Sentence writing performance
WP	Writing performance
WSU	Wolaita Sodo University
WSUDTC	Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha Campus

LIST OF PUBLISHED ARTICLES

LIST OF PUBLISHED ARTICLES 14
Article 1: Effect of L1 Use on Students' Essay Writing Performance (EWP) in English Language Classroom 14
Article 2: Examining the Impact of Code-Switching on Students' Paragraph Writing in EFL Classrooms 26

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDICES 235
Appendix A1: Students' paper correction checklist (Main Rubric) 235
Appendix B1: Interview guide (for teachers) 237
Appendix C1: Course Syllabus of Advanced Composition in English (EnLa 2071) 238
Appendix D1: Class schedule 243
Appendix E1: List of Participant Students 244
Appendix F1: Consent Form for Research Participants 245
Appendix G1: Pretest (main study) 247
Appendix H1: Student grouping based on pretest result (main study) 251
Appendix I1: Participant students sorted by ID number 252
Appendix J1: Posttest (main study) 253
Appendix K1: A classroom audio 1 transcribed (EO) 258
Appendix L1: A classroom audio 2 transcribed (CS) 262
Appendix M1: A classroom audio 3 transcribed (EO) 266
Appendix N1: A classroom audio 4 transcribed (CS) 270
Appendix O1: Posttest result of sentence writing 273
Appendix P1: Posttest result of Paragraph writing 274
Appendix Q1: Posttest result of Essay writing 276
Appendix R1: Independent Samples T-Test for Pretest Performance 278
Appendix S1: Independent Samples T-Test for Language as a feature of writing at sentence level 279
Appendix T1: Independent Samples T-Test for Structure as a feature of writing at sentence level 279
Appendix U1: Independent Samples T-Test for Total average performance on sentence writing 280
Appendix V1: Independent Samples T-Test for Structure as a feature of writing at paragraph level 281
Appendix W1: Independent Samples T-Test for Idea Development as a feature of writing at paragraph level 282
Appendix X1: Independent Samples T-Test for Explicitness as a feature of writing at paragraph level 283
Appendix B2: Independent Samples T-Test for Idea Development as a feature of writing at essay level 287

Appendix Z1: Independent Samples T-Test for Total average performance on paragraph writing 285
Appendix A2: Independent Samples T-Test for Structure as a feature of writing at essay level 286
Appendix Y1: Independent Samples T-Test for Language as a feature of writing at paragraph level 284
Appendix C2: Independent Samples T-Test for Explicitness as a feature of writing at essay level 288
Appendix D2: Independent Samples T-Test for Language as a feature of writing at essay level 289
Appendix E2: Independent Samples T-Test for Total average performance on essay writing ... 290
Appendix F2: Independent Samples T-Test for Total average performance on POSTTEST 291
Appendix G2: General Linear Model Output of Paragraph-Level Writing 292
Appendix K2: Interview Transcript 2 303
Appendix I2: General Linear Model Output of Comparison across Levels of Writing 298
Appendix J2: Interview Transcript 1 301
Appendix H2: General Linear Model Output of Essay-Level Writing 295

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This chapter offers an overview of the study by first presenting the background that situates the research. It delineates the research problem by identifying the underlying issues, knowledge gaps, and challenges that need systematic investigation. The chapter further articulates the specific research objectives that inform the methodological approaches followed. Moreover, this chapter specifies the scope of the research by clarifying the parameters within which the study is conducted, along with the key significances and limitations.

1.1 Background of the Study

The study of second language acquisition (SLA) has long recognized the diversity of pathways through which individuals acquire a second language (L2). The process of L2 acquisition is shaped by a range of internal and external factors, including instructional contexts, linguistic environments, cognitive variables, and socio-affective influences (Ellis, 2015; Ortega, 2014). While there are general developmental stages in L2 learning, the rate and success of acquisition vary significantly among learners due to individual differences and contextual factors (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Among these, classroom language use—whether through an English-Only (EO) approach or the incorporation of learners' first language—has remained a central issue in SLA research.

Language instruction plays a crucial role in shaping the linguistic input learners receive, which is fundamental for language acquisition (Gass & Mackey, 2020). The debate over the optimal language of instruction has traditionally been framed around EO versus Code-Switching (CS). While EO proponents emphasize maximizing exposure to L2 input, others argue for the pedagogical value of incorporating learners' L1 to enhance comprehension and engagement (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009).

In recent years, the concept of translanguaging has emerged as a broader theoretical framework that extends beyond code-switching. Translanguaging refers to the fluid and dynamic use of a speaker's entire linguistic repertoire without strict boundaries between languages. Unlike code-switching, which is often viewed as the alternation between two distinct linguistic systems, translanguaging conceptualizes language use as an integrated process where linguistic resources

are drawn upon simultaneously to construct meaning. This perspective challenges traditional monolingual norms and emphasizes the holistic nature of bilingual cognition.

However, despite its theoretical richness, translanguaging is often more abstract and less clearly operationalized in classroom-based empirical studies. In contrast, code-switching provides a more clearly defined and observable pedagogical practice, involving the deliberate alternation between L1 and L2 for specific instructional purposes. This makes CS particularly suitable for structured classroom research, where variables need to be controlled and measured. In addition, in contexts such as Ethiopia—where English is the mandated medium of instruction at higher levels and classrooms are highly multilingual—translanguaging practices may be difficult to standardize or implement consistently. Code-switching, therefore, offers a more practical and manageable framework for investigating the role of L1 in L2 instruction.

Proponents of EO instruction argue that immersive exposure to L2 promotes naturalistic acquisition. According to Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis, comprehensible input in the target language is essential for acquisition, and increased exposure enhances language proficiency. Similarly, Ellis (2015) suggests that maximizing L2 input accelerates fluency and accuracy. However, such approaches assume that learners possess sufficient proficiency to process L2 input effectively.

Conversely, research supports the strategic use of CS as a cognitive and pedagogical resource. Code-switching can scaffold comprehension, reduce cognitive load, and facilitate meaning-making, particularly when learners encounter linguistic difficulties (Macaro, 2014; Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008). Lee (2010) further notes that CS can enhance learner engagement and create a more inclusive classroom environment.

Language teaching methodologies have historically reflected differing views on L1 use. The Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) emphasized L1 for explicit instruction (Richards & Rodgers, 2014), while the Direct Method promoted exclusive L2 use. More recent approaches, such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), acknowledge the potential role of L1 in facilitating meaningful interaction while maintaining a focus on L2 use (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 2014).

The question of how much L1 use is optimal remains unresolved. Research suggests that moderate and purposeful CS can support comprehension without hindering L2 development (Cook, 2001). Auerbach (1993) argues that judicious L1 use reduces anxiety and enhances learner autonomy, particularly in low-proficiency contexts.

Empirical studies have demonstrated the benefits of CS in areas such as vocabulary acquisition, writing development, and academic achievement. For instance, Bakhtiari (2014), Garza and Nava (2005), and Spice (2018) found that CS facilitates vocabulary learning by providing semantic clarity and reducing cognitive overload. Similarly, Simasiku, Kasanda, and Smit (2015) showed that CS enhances classroom participation and conceptual understanding.

In writing instruction, L1 use has been shown to support idea generation and organization. Nation (2003) notes that L1 discussion prior to writing tasks can improve coherence and structure. Studies by Lameta-Tufuga (1994) and Knight (1996) further demonstrate that learners who use L1 during pre-writing produce more developed and lexically rich compositions. These findings suggest that L1 can function as a cognitive tool for conceptualization before transferring ideas into L2.

The Ethiopian educational context adds further complexity to this issue. The Education and Training Policy (FDRE, 1994) mandates English as the medium of instruction at secondary and higher education levels, effectively promoting an EO approach. However, given the country's extensive linguistic diversity and varying levels of English proficiency, strict EO policies may present challenges for learners (Heugh, 2010). This raises important questions about the role of L1 in supporting academic achievement.

The focus on writing in this study is both practical and theoretical. Writing allows for controlled analysis of language use, as it is less influenced by situational variables than speaking (Hyland, 2019). It also involves multiple stages—planning, drafting, revising, and editing—where CS can occur strategically. Research suggests that CS during pre-writing enhances idea organization and overall writing quality (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003).

The ongoing debate between EO and CS remains unresolved, particularly in multilingual contexts such as Ethiopia. This study, therefore, seeks to contribute to this discourse by

empirically examining the effects of code-switching on L2 writing performance, with a focus on its practical implications for teaching and learning.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Ethiopia is a linguistically, ethnically, and culturally diverse nation where English plays an increasingly important role, particularly in education, business, and administration. However, in many other parts of the country, English remains largely confined to formal classroom instruction, limiting students' exposure to the language (Amlaku, 2013). In such contexts—where learners share a common L1, rely on it for daily communication, and have minimal interaction with English outside school—developing proficiency in L2 becomes particularly challenging. This situation highlights the need to consider the potential role of L1 as a pedagogical resource in facilitating English language learning.

The role of L1 in L2 instruction has long been debated in language pedagogy. While some approaches advocate for exclusive use of English to maximize exposure and promote acquisition (Krashen, 1985; Ellis, 2015), others support the strategic use of L1 to enhance comprehension and reduce cognitive load (Cook, 2001; Macaro, 2014). More recent perspectives suggest a balanced approach, allowing for selective and purposeful L1 use without undermining L2 development (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009). However, the question of how much L1 use is optimal, and under what conditions it is most effective, remains unresolved.

Research has explored the role of L1 in various aspects of L2 learning, including vocabulary acquisition, comprehension, and writing. Studies indicate that code-switching can support learning by providing semantic clarity and facilitating meaning-making (Mehisto, Marsh, & Frigols, 2008; Lee, 2010). In writing, L1 use during pre-writing stages has been shown to enhance idea generation and organization, leading to improved coherence and text quality (Nation, 2003; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). Similarly, studies by Lameta-Tufuga (1994) and Knight (1996), as cited in Nation (2003), demonstrate that learners who engage in L1 discussion before writing tasks produce more developed and coherent L2 texts. Furthermore, L1 translation has been identified as an effective strategy for vocabulary learning due to its ability to provide clear and immediate meaning connections (Laufer & Girsai, 2008; Nation, 2003).

In the Ethiopian context, several studies have examined attitudes toward code-switching and L1 use in English language classrooms (Kenenisa, 2003; Nigatu, 2013; Yinager, 2018). However, these studies have largely focused on perceptions rather than measurable learning outcomes, and they have given limited attention to writing as a specific skill area. As a result, there remains a lack of empirical evidence regarding the impact of code-switching on students' writing performance.

In practice, teachers often hold differing views about the use of L1 in the classroom. Some perceive code-switching as a useful instructional strategy that supports comprehension and learner engagement, while others view it as a sign of inadequate English proficiency. These perceptions are often shaped by expectations from administrators, parents, and students, who may associate strict English-only use with higher teaching quality. Consequently, teachers who incorporate L1 may experience uncertainty or hesitation, despite research suggesting its potential pedagogical value (Auerbach, 1993).

Given these gaps and challenges, this study aims to examine the effect of code-switching on students' writing performance in English. By focusing on writing as a cognitively demanding and measurable skill (Hyland, 2019), the study seeks to provide empirical evidence that can inform instructional practices and contribute to a clearer understanding of the role of L1 in multilingual educational contexts.

1.3 Research Objectives

The overarching objective of this study is to examine the effectiveness of code-switching in enhancing students' writing performance. Specifically, this study aims to:

1. examine which instructional approach—code-switching or English-only—leads to higher student performance in English writing tasks;
2. scrutinize the effect of code-switching on the grammatical accuracy of students' English writing;
3. assess whether students exposed to code-switching during instruction produce more coherent and cohesive English texts than those taught using an English-only approach;

4. investigate the extent to which code-switching enhances students' idea development and organizational skills in English writing;
5. assess whether code-switching contributes to improved clarity in students' English writing;
6. compare the impact of code-switching across various aspects of writing—grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity—to determine where its influence is most significant;
7. identify the writing level (sentence, paragraph, or essay) at which students benefit most from the use of code-switching;
8. investigate the perception of English language teachers on the role of code-switching on students' English language learning

1.4 Research Questions

The integration of students' L1 in L2 classrooms, particularly in writing instruction, raises several critical questions that are essential for informing pedagogical decisions and establishing a theoretical foundation for language instruction practices. This study seeks to address the following research questions:

1. How does code-switching affect the grammatical accuracy of students' English writing?
2. Do students exposed to code-switching during instruction produce more coherent and cohesive English texts than those taught using an English-only approach?
3. To what extent does code-switching enhance students' idea development and organizational skills in English writing?
4. Does code-switching contribute to improved clarity in students' English writing?
5. How does the impact of code-switching vary across different aspects of writing—grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity—and in which area is its influence most significant?
6. At which writing level (sentence, paragraph, or essay) do students benefit most from the use of code-switching?
7. Which instructional approach—code-switching or English-only—leads to higher student performance in English writing tasks?

8. How do English language teachers perceive the role of code-switching on students' language learning?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed to guide the investigation of the effects of code-switching on students' English writing performance.

Hypothesis 1: Effect on **Grammatical Accuracy**

H_{01}: Code-switching has no statistically significant effect on the grammatical accuracy of students' English writing.

H_{11}: Code-switching has a statistically significant effect on the grammatical accuracy of students' English writing.

Hypothesis 2: Effect on Coherence and Cohesion

H_{02}: There is no statistically significant difference in the coherence and cohesion of English texts produced by students exposed to code-switching and those taught using an English-only approach.

H_{12}: Students exposed to code-switching during instruction produce English texts that are significantly more coherent and cohesive than those produced by students taught using an English-only approach.

Hypothesis 3: Effect on Idea Development

H_{03}: Code-switching does not significantly enhance students' idea development and organizational skills in English writing.

H_{13}: Code-switching significantly enhances students' idea development and organizational skills in English writing.

Hypothesis 4: Effect on Clarity in Writing

H_{04}: Code-switching does not significantly contribute to improved clarity in students' English writing.

H_{14}: Code-switching significantly contributes to improved clarity in students' English writing.

Hypothesis 5: Differential Impact across Writing Aspects

H_{05}: Code-switching does not have a statistically significant differential impact across grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity in students' English writing.

H_{15}: Code-switching has a statistically significant differential impact across grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity, with its influence being significantly greater in at least one of these aspects.

Hypothesis 6: Writing Level Differences

H_{06}: There is no statistically significant difference in the effect of code-switching across sentence-level, paragraph-level, and essay-level writing.

H_{16}: Code-switching has a statistically significant effect that varies across writing levels, with students benefiting more at one level (sentence, paragraph, or essay) than the others.

Hypothesis 7: Instructional Approach and Overall Writing Performance

H_{07}: There is no statistically significant difference in students' English writing performance between those taught using a code-switching instructional approach and those taught using an English-only approach.

H_{17}: Students taught using a code-switching instructional approach demonstrate significantly higher English writing performance than those taught using an English-only approach.

1.6 Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT), a pedagogical approach that emphasizes the inclusion of students' cultural backgrounds and identities in the learning process.

CRT aims to create an inclusive educational environment where students feel valued, respected, and motivated to engage in learning. As Wlodkowski and Ginsberg (1995, cited in Allen, 2015) define it, CRT is "a pedagogy that crosses disciplines and cultures to engage learners while respecting their cultural integrity. It accommodates the dynamic mix of race, ethnicity, class, gender, region, religion, and family that contributes to every student's cultural identity" (p. 8). By integrating students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds into instruction, CRT fosters a learning environment that enhances students' sense of belonging, thereby increasing motivation and improving learning outcomes.

One of the fundamental principles of CRT is that acknowledging and incorporating students' cultural identities in the learning process leads to greater academic success (Allen, 2015). When students see their linguistic and cultural backgrounds valued in the classroom, they develop higher motivation and confidence, which enhances their willingness to engage in the learning process. In the context of second language instruction, the use of code-switching—the strategic alternation between students' first language and the target language—aligns with CRT by validating students' linguistic resources and reducing language anxiety. By allowing students to leverage their existing linguistic knowledge, CS not only facilitates comprehension but also fosters a more supportive and interactive learning environment.

The relevance of CRT becomes even more pronounced when considering the distinctions between second language (SL) learning and foreign language (FL) learning. While learners in an SL environment are typically immersed in a society where the target language is actively spoken and have clear communicative objectives, FL learners often lack direct exposure to native speakers and may have limited practical use for the language beyond academic settings. Unlike SL learners, who often have intrinsic motivation to acquire the target language for social integration or professional advancement, FL learners frequently study the language as part of a compulsory curriculum without a personally driven purpose. This difference in motivation necessitates distinct instructional approaches tailored to the specific needs of FL learners, making culturally responsive strategies, such as CS, particularly valuable in these contexts.

Given that FL learners often study a language chosen by external authorities rather than as a personal choice, they may feel disconnected from the learning process. CS serves as a bridge

between their existing linguistic knowledge and the new language they are acquiring, helping them relate to the content more effectively. By integrating L1 judiciously into L2 instruction, teachers can create a sense of familiarity and engagement that facilitates deeper comprehension and retention. This approach aligns with CRT's emphasis on affirming students' identities and ensuring that instruction is meaningful and relevant to their experiences.

This study adopts CRT as a guiding theoretical framework to examine the role of CS in L2 writing instruction. By embracing students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, CRT supports the notion that L1 use in L2 classrooms—when applied strategically—can enhance students' confidence, motivation, and overall language proficiency. The study thus explores the extent to which CS can serve as a culturally responsive strategy to address the specific needs of FL learners and improve their writing performance in the L2.

1.7 Significance of the Study

In the field of English language teaching, particularly in Ethiopian context, there is no document on why and when to use students' L1 or English in English classroom. The level of education or students' English proficiency at which English-Only should be used has not been determined. The extent of CS to be used for teaching different language skills is also not there. Thus, this study came up with important issues on whether classroom CS hinders or facilitates students writing skills development. This is useful for English teachers and English curriculum developers in including or excluding medium shift with clear purposes.

The findings of this study can also be used as basis for the further studies in order to make fertile ground for decisions of classroom language use.

1.8 Delimitation of the Study

This study is specifically focused on examining whether classroom code-switching significantly enhances students' writing performance. The scope of the study is intentionally limited to these aspects and does not extend to investigating the differential effects of code-switching based on variables such as students' proficiency levels, gender, age, or other demographic and cognitive factors.

Furthermore, the study is geographically and institutionally delimited to students enrolled in the Dawrootsuwa Department at Wolaita Sodo University, Dawro Tarcha Campus. The findings of this research, therefore, reflect the experiences and outcomes of this specific student population and may not be generalizable to learners in different educational contexts or linguistic backgrounds.

1.9 Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into six chapters. Chapter One provides an introduction, outlining the background of the study, statement of the problem, research objectives, hypotheses, research questions, significance, and delimitation. Chapter Two presents a review of relevant literature. Chapter Three details the research design and methodology, including data collection methods and analysis procedures. Chapter Four analyzes and presents the data, summarizing key findings. Chapter Five presents the discussion of the main study findings. Finally, Chapter Six draws conclusions and offers recommendations for future research and pedagogical implications.

1.10 Limitations of the Study

Despite the achievements, this study faced a significant limitation related to the small sample size. This constraint restricts the generalizability of the findings, as the limited number of participants may not adequately represent the broader population. Consequently, caution should be exercised when attempting to apply these results to larger or more diverse groups, as the conclusions drawn may not hold true beyond the specific context of the study.

1.11 Definition of Key Terms

This section presents what the under mentioned terms mean in the present study.

Instructional type (classroom instructional type) refers to the classroom language use. That is, it stands for whether English-Only or Code-Switching is used during English course teaching and learning.

Code-Switching (CS) refers to the planned deliberate use of students' mother tongue in English course classroom. It does not mean the complete use of students' L1 which may be considered as translation.

Writing performance stands for the ability the students show in their writing in terms of the correction criteria.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the existing body of literature relevant to the study in order to establish a comprehensive understanding of the theories, concepts, and empirical findings that inform the research. It synthesizes prior studies to identify prevailing trends, debates, and methodological approaches, while also highlighting gaps and inconsistencies that the present study seeks to address.

2.1 The Nature of Writing

Writing has been conceptualized in diverse ways within academic literature, commonly regarded as a process of encoding thought into a communicative medium. At its core, writing enables individuals to externalize cognitive processes through language, serving as a vehicle for expressing ideas, emotions, and intentions. Dougherty (1985, p. 2) describes writing as a creative act, stating that "our words give shape to our thoughts and feelings, and what we produce is uniquely ours — a construct no less creative than a piece of music, a painting, or a sculpture." This perspective emphasizes the inherent creativity of writing, portraying it as both a reflective and generative process.

In language instruction, writing is often defined as "the domain of language proficiency that encompasses how students engage in written communication in a variety of forms for a variety of purposes and audiences" (Zeleke, 2013, p. 41). This definition underscores writing as a multifaceted skill requiring adaptability across contexts, purposes, and audiences. Hyland (2018) supports this view, framing writing as a socially situated practice through which individuals engage with discourse communities to fulfill communicative goals. Accordingly, writing transcends linguistic accuracy, encompassing socio-cognitive and cultural dimensions.

The act of writing involves a continuum of skills, ranging from micro-level abilities—such as lexical choice and syntactic accuracy—to macro-level competencies, including coherence and organization. Graham and Harris (2021) characterize writing as a complex cognitive activity that integrates linguistic knowledge, strategic planning, and metacognitive regulation. Kellogg (2020) similarly distinguishes between lower-order processes (e.g., transcription, grammar) and higher-

order processes (e.g., idea generation, structuring, and revision), emphasizing the layered nature of writing.

Beyond its role as a communicative skill, writing is a powerful tool for learning and constructing knowledge. Bazerman et al. (2020) argue that writing fosters deeper engagement with content by enabling individuals to organize, synthesize, and critically evaluate information. This aligns with cognitive process theories that view writing as recursive and dynamic, marked by continual idea refinement through drafting and revising.

The digital era has further transformed the nature of writing. Zheng and Warschauer (2022) note that technological advancements have expanded the modes and contexts of written communication, giving rise to new literacies and reshaping how individuals engage with text. Writing is now not only a static product but also a dynamic process influenced by multimedia, online platforms, and collaborative tools.

Writing, therefore, is not a mechanical task but a multifaceted, dynamic process involving the interplay of three fundamental components: the text, the writer, and the reader. Silva and Matsuda (2002) highlight that successful writing requires attention to these interrelated elements—balancing the message, the writer's intent, and the audience's expectations.

The communicative function of writing is further emphasized by Burnett and Kastman (1997), who describe it as a medium for conveying meaning to others. They note that written meaning is co-constructed by readers based on their background knowledge and interpretive frameworks. Writing, then, is inherently social and interactive, shaped by both the writer's intent and the reader's perspective.

Writing is also contextual, embedded within specific cultural, institutional, and situational frameworks (Kern, 2000; Hyland, 2021). Each genre of writing, from academic to creative, adheres to distinct norms and expectations. Consequently, effective writing necessitates contextual awareness, influencing both content and form.

Moreover, writing is often collaborative. Harmer (2001) and Burnett and Kastman (1997) assert that writers rarely work in isolation; rather, they draw on interactions—through conversation,

shared texts, or personal experience—to shape and refine their ideas. This collaborative dimension highlights the social underpinnings of writing and its evolution through dialogue and feedback.

Among the four macro-language skills, writing is widely regarded as the most challenging (Hickey, 2010; Alsamadani, 2010). Its complexity arises from the integration of cognitive, linguistic, affective, and psychomotor skills. Unlike speech, which permits real-time feedback and tolerates certain errors, writing demands precision and coherence, along with mastery of conventions such as grammar, punctuation, and logical flow.

These challenges are magnified for second and foreign language learners. As Alsamadani (2010) and Nunan (1989) observe, non-native writers face added linguistic and cognitive demands, including mastery of grammar, vocabulary, and rhetorical structures. These difficulties can hinder their ability to express and organize ideas effectively, reinforcing the need for targeted instructional support.

Generally, writing is a dynamic, communicative, contextual, and collaborative process that engages multiple dimensions of human cognition and interaction. Its complexity, especially for language learners, underscores the importance of deliberate, supportive instruction to cultivate writing proficiency across varied contexts.

2.2 The Development of Writing

Although writing is believed to have originated thousands of years ago, contemporary practices, such as writing with pen or pencil on paper or composing text on electronic devices, are relatively recent innovations. Halliday (1989) posits that the development of writing is intricately linked with the emergence of humankind itself. In its earliest stages, humans expressed their thoughts and emotions through drawings and symbols inscribed on materials such as wood, leather, clay, and stone. According to Zeleke (2013, p. 41), this transition from oral communication to written expression occurred because “speech, which is nearly as old as mankind itself and was a predominant means of communication, became inadequate to enable mankind to perform activities requiring advanced social interaction.” This observation

underscores the necessity of writing as a tool for facilitating complex social, cultural, and economic interactions.

The evolution of writing has undergone a series of significant transformations, encompassing the shapes, sizes, and orthographic conventions of various languages. In the case of the English language, for instance, the orthography of early fourteenth-century English was markedly different from that of contemporary English. Changes in spelling conventions and the forms of certain letters illustrate how writing systems adapt over time to accommodate shifts in linguistic, cultural, and technological contexts (Zeleke, 2013). These developments reflect broader linguistic phenomena, as writing systems evolve to reflect changing speech patterns and social norms.

Moreover, modern research traces the historical development of writing as a process influenced by both technological and sociocultural advancements. According to Bazerman et al. (2020), the invention of the printing press in the 15th century marked a pivotal moment in the evolution of writing, as it enabled the standardization of texts and the dissemination of knowledge on an unprecedented scale. Similarly, more recent technological advancements, such as the advent of digital tools and platforms, have transformed the way writing is produced, shared, and consumed (Zheng & Warschauer, 2022). These technological innovations not only facilitate writing but also redefine its forms, expanding its potential as a mode of communication and expression.

Thus, the development of writing is a dynamic and iterative process, shaped by the interaction of human creativity, linguistic evolution, and technological progress. As writing systems continue to adapt to new contexts, they remain indispensable to human civilization, serving as a fundamental means of preserving knowledge, fostering communication, and enabling societal advancement.

2.2.1 The history of teaching writing

The history of teaching writing in English has undergone significant transformations, reflecting shifts in linguistic theory, pedagogical approaches, and sociocultural considerations. Until the late 1960s, writing was largely neglected as a component of language learning, primarily due to the dominance of environmentalist perspectives in linguistic and educational thought. These perspectives, rooted in structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology, equated language with

speech and framed language learning as a mechanical process governed by a stimulus-response-reinforcement chain (Skinner, 1957; Fries, 1945). In this paradigm, writing was regarded as secondary to speech, serving merely as its orthographic representation.

Silva and Matsuda (2002) argue that it was widely believed that learners must first master spoken language and its orthographic conventions before engaging with writing, as discrepancies between speech sounds and written forms were thought to interfere with effective learning. Consequently, writing was relegated to a reinforcement role, supporting grammatical and lexical accuracy that, in turn, facilitated oral fluency. More recent research by Hyland (2019) and Tardy (2021) highlights how contemporary perspectives integrate both speech and writing in language acquisition, challenging earlier compartmentalized views.

During this period, language programs emphasized formal correctness in writing. Instruction typically centered on activities such as sentence imitation, manipulation, and controlled writing exercises designed to minimize first-language interference (Kroll, 2001; Leki, 1992). The teacher's role was narrowly focused on instilling grammatical accuracy through repetitive practice, reflecting a product-oriented approach to writing pedagogy. Writing was seen as a static product, and the creative and intellectual processes underlying composition were largely ignored (Tribble, 1996).

2.2.1.1 The shift to process-oriented approaches

A paradigm shift began to emerge in the late 1970s and early 1980s, marked by the transition from a product-oriented to a process-oriented approach to teaching writing (Zamel, 1982; Flower & Hayes, 1981). This new approach emphasized the procedural aspects of writing, encouraging students to focus on discovering ideas, solving rhetorical problems, and revising their work through multiple drafts. Advocates of the process approach, such as Zeleke (2013), emphasized that writing is an iterative process involving planning, drafting, editing, revising, and rewriting. The mantra “writing is a process, not a product” gained widespread acceptance during this period (Murray, 1972; Emig, 1971).

Process-oriented pedagogy was deeply influenced by expressive and cognitive learning theories. Expressivists, such as Elbow (1973) and Britton (1975), emphasized fluency and self-expression

as the primary goals of writing instruction, viewing the teacher as a facilitator who helps learners articulate their thoughts and emotions without concern for formal conventions. Personalized and nondirective instructional practices aimed to cultivate students' individual voices and empower their inner writers. In contrast, cognitivists focused on the mental processes involved in writing, such as problem-solving, planning, and critical thinking. They argued that effective writing required higher-order cognitive skills, including defining rhetorical problems, contextualizing ideas, generating solutions, and drawing evidence-based conclusions (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987).

Despite its contributions, the process approach faced criticism for its limitations. Kim (2005) notes that the process-oriented model largely ignored the social and cultural contexts in which writing occurs, focusing instead on individual writers' cognitive processes. Additionally, the rigid application of predefined steps in the writing process failed to account for variations in topic, audience, and purpose (Hyland, 2003). More recent critiques by Canagarajah (2020) and Street (2022) further challenge the traditional cognitive models by emphasizing multimodal and multilingual approaches to writing instruction.

2.2.1.2 Contextual and disciplinary focus

From the late 1980s to the late 1990s, the focus of writing pedagogy shifted to align more closely with students' academic disciplines and areas of study. This period was characterized by the integration of subject-specific content into writing tasks, with instructors taking on the role of designing writing activities that reflected disciplinary conventions and academic contexts (Johns, 1997; Swales, 1990). Writing instruction increasingly emphasized the importance of preparing students to meet the expectations of their academic and professional communities. The emergence of genre-based pedagogy (Hyland, 2004; Martin, 1993) underscored the necessity of teaching students to recognize and produce texts that adhered to disciplinary discourse structures. Recent scholarship, such as that of Devitt (2021), highlights the evolving nature of genre-based instruction and its adaptation to digital and hybrid learning environments.

2.2.1.3 Recent developments in writing pedagogy

Since the early 2000s, writing instruction has been shaped by diverse theoretical frameworks, leading to ongoing debates about the primary focus of writing pedagogy. Some scholars argue that the emphasis has shifted toward addressing sociopolitical issues and promoting critical pedagogy (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Pennycook, 2001). This approach encourages students to engage with broader societal concerns, fostering critical awareness and agency through their writing. Recent work by Janks (2021) and Ivanič (2022) continues this discussion by emphasizing writing as a tool for social transformation and advocacy.

Others, such as Raimes (1998), contend that greater attention has been placed on readers and discursive communities, highlighting the importance of audience awareness and rhetorical context in shaping written communication. Theories of social constructionism have also exerted a significant influence on contemporary writing pedagogy. Social constructionist approaches emphasize the role of community in shaping discourse and stress the importance of understanding the expectations of specific discourse communities (Bazerman, 1988; Lave & Wenger, 1991). More recently, Blommaert (2020) has expanded on these ideas by discussing translingual practices in writing and how linguistic diversity impacts composition in academic and professional settings.

By integrating contextual, cultural, and disciplinary considerations into writing instruction, these approaches aim to equip students with the skills necessary to navigate complex communicative landscapes in both academic and professional settings. Recent studies have also explored the role of digital technologies and multimodal composition in reshaping writing instruction (Kress, 2010; Lankshear & Knobel, 2006). Scholars such as Shipka (2021) and DePalma (2023) continue to investigate how digital and multimodal literacies redefine the writing process and instructional practices.

2.2.2 Factors affecting writing skills development

The development of writing skills is a complex, multifaceted process influenced by numerous internal and external factors. Effective writing is a key skill for academic, professional, and personal success, but the acquisition and refinement of writing skills are not uniform across

individuals. This literature review aims to examine the various factors that contribute to the development of writing skills, including cognitive abilities, educational experiences, social context, and environmental influences.

2.2.2.1 Cognitive factors

Writing is often viewed as a product of various cognitive processes, including attention, memory, and executive functioning. Cognitive load theory, proposed by Sweller (1988), suggests that writing is an intricate cognitive task that involves working memory and attention. High cognitive load can impede the writing process, leading to less coherent or less sophisticated writing. This cognitive load may arise when individuals struggle with both the planning and execution of writing simultaneously. As a result, students with lower cognitive resources may find it difficult to produce quality writing.

Additionally, the role of metacognition—being aware of one's own thinking processes—has been identified as crucial for writing development. Authors such as Zimmerman (2002) suggest that metacognitive strategies, such as goal-setting, self-monitoring, and self-regulation, can significantly enhance writing abilities. Metacognition allows writers to plan, revise, and evaluate their work, which is particularly vital in the writing process. Research by Graham and Harris (2005) demonstrates that students who are taught to use metacognitive strategies exhibit stronger writing performance than those who are not.

Another cognitive factor is language proficiency. Linguistic abilities, including vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure, directly influence writing quality. A study by Snow (2010) emphasizes that writing proficiency is linked to an individual's ability to manipulate language effectively. Students with a larger vocabulary and a better grasp of grammar and syntax tend to produce more complex and coherent written texts. The development of these linguistic skills begins early and is often shaped by both formal education and informal language exposure.

2.2.2.2 Educational influences

The educational environment is one of the most significant factors affecting writing development. The quality of instruction and the curriculum in place can either foster or hinder

the growth of writing skills. A study by Berninger et al. (2010) highlighted the importance of early writing instruction, showing that interventions in the early stages of education can have lasting effects on students' writing abilities. This includes teaching foundational skills, such as handwriting, spelling, and basic sentence structure. Without a strong foundation in these early stages, students may struggle to develop advanced writing skills in later years.

Moreover, explicit instruction on writing strategies has been shown to improve writing performance. Studies have found that writing instruction that includes a focus on the writing process—prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing—helps students organize their thoughts and improve the coherence of their work (Graham & Perin, 2007). This strategy-based approach contrasts with traditional approaches that might emphasize grammar and mechanics over the overall structure of writing.

The role of teacher feedback is another critical element in the educational context. Effective feedback can guide students in revising their work and developing a deeper understanding of the writing process. However, the nature of the feedback is essential. Formative feedback that is constructive, specific, and timely is more likely to result in improvements in writing skills (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Teachers' use of feedback that focuses on both content and form is beneficial for students at various levels of writing proficiency.

Furthermore, research by Applebee and Langer (2011) suggests that the teaching of writing should be integrated into a broader language arts curriculum. Writing is most effectively taught in connection with reading, speaking, and listening. These interconnected skills foster a more holistic approach to language learning, where writing is seen as an integral part of communication rather than as a standalone skill.

2.2.2.3 Social and cultural factors

Writing does not occur in isolation, and social and cultural contexts play a significant role in shaping writing abilities. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (1978) posits that learning is a socially mediated process, where individuals develop skills through interactions with more knowledgeable others, such as teachers, peers, and family members. Collaborative writing and peer review processes are often employed in educational settings to enhance students' writing

skills. Research by MacArthur (2010) supports the idea that peer interactions, such as group writing tasks and peer feedback, contribute positively to writing development by providing diverse perspectives and opportunities for revision.

Cultural factors also influence writing development. For instance, students from diverse cultural backgrounds may encounter challenges when writing in academic contexts, which often emphasize specific genres, structures, and conventions of writing (Hyland, 2003). The adaptation to these conventions may take time, and students may face difficulties in adjusting to the writing expectations of different academic or professional environments. Writing instruction that is culturally responsive and inclusive can help bridge these gaps by recognizing and validating diverse writing styles and experiences.

Additionally, the role of motivation cannot be overstated in the context of writing development. Motivational theories such as Deci and Ryan's (1985) Self-Determination Theory suggest that intrinsic motivation plays a pivotal role in developing writing skills. When students feel autonomy in their writing tasks and see value in the writing process, they are more likely to engage in and improve their writing. Writing tasks that are meaningful, purposeful, and relevant to the students' own interests and experiences have been shown to lead to greater engagement and better outcomes.

2.2.2.4 Environmental and technological factors

In the modern era, environmental factors such as access to technology also affect writing development. The proliferation of digital tools has changed the way individuals approach writing. Computer-mediated writing, word processing, and digital collaboration tools can both support and challenge the writing process. On the one hand, technology allows for easier editing, research, and access to resources, which can enhance writing productivity and quality (Cunningham & Allington, 2011). On the other hand, distractions from social media, gaming, or entertainment can detract from focused writing efforts.

Furthermore, the increasing use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools in writing has sparked a debate about the impact of such technologies on writing skills. While tools like grammar checkers, style editors, and AI-assisted writing platforms offer assistance to writers, there are

concerns that these technologies might lead to a decrease in the development of critical writing skills. Studies have indicated that students who rely too heavily on automated writing tools may not develop the self-regulation and metacognitive skills necessary for independent writing (Roscoe & Chi, 2007). Therefore, it is crucial for educators to find a balance between leveraging technological tools and ensuring that students continue to develop foundational writing skills.

In conclusion, the development of writing skills is shaped by a combination of cognitive, educational, social, cultural, and environmental factors. Cognitive factors such as metacognition, language proficiency, and cognitive load play a fundamental role in writing development. Educational influences, including early instruction, strategy-based teaching, and effective feedback, significantly enhance writing abilities. Social and cultural factors, including collaborative learning and cultural adaptability, are also crucial in shaping how individuals approach writing tasks. Finally, environmental influences, particularly the impact of technology, present both opportunities and challenges in the writing process.

The interaction between these various factors suggests that writing development is a dynamic and multifactorial process. To promote the development of writing skills, educators must adopt a holistic approach that considers the cognitive, social, and cultural dimensions of writing, while also acknowledging the potential impact of technological advancements. Future research should continue to explore these relationships, focusing on how specific interventions in each area can optimize writing instruction and support learners in becoming skilled and confident writers.

2.2.3 Language proficiency and writing development

Writing in a second language is a cognitively demanding task that draws on a learner's linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural resources. The development of L2 writing proficiency is a gradual process shaped by multiple interrelated factors, including the learner's first language, exposure to the target language, instructional context, and cognitive development. This section reviews the literature on four critical areas related to L2 writing development: the influence of L1 on L2 writing, developmental stages in L2 writing acquisition, the cognitive and linguistic challenges faced by L2 writers, and the distinction between academic and conversational language proficiency as proposed by Cummins.

2.2.3.1 Influence of L1

The influence of a learner's first language on their second language writing is well-documented in second language acquisition (SLA) research. According to contrastive rhetoric theory (Kaplan, 1966), L1 writing conventions—such as organizational patterns, rhetorical structures, and argumentation styles—often transfer to L2 writing, positively or negatively. For example, students from cultures with inductive rhetorical norms may initially struggle to adapt to the more deductive, linear structure often expected in English academic writing.

Cummins (1981) proposes the Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis, which posits that proficiency in L1 facilitates the development of L2 skills, particularly in cognitively demanding tasks like writing. When learners have strong literacy skills in their L1, such as planning, drafting, and editing, these strategies can transfer to L2 writing, even when the surface linguistic features differ. Research by Genesee et al. (2006) supports this claim, showing that bilingual students with well-developed L1 literacy tend to perform better in L2 academic writing tasks.

However, negative transfer or interference can also occur when learners apply L1 rules or structures that are not compatible with L2 norms (Odlin, 1989). This may result in grammatical errors, unnatural phrasing, or culturally incongruent text organization. Teachers and curriculum designers must, therefore, account for both the supportive and potentially obstructive roles of L1 in shaping L2 writing development.

2.2.3.2 Stages of L2 writing development

L2 writing proficiency develops over time through several interrelated stages, which reflect both language acquisition and writing process maturity. According to Silva (1993), novice L2 writers initially produce writing that is simpler in syntax, shorter in length, and more limited in vocabulary compared to native speakers. As learners gain proficiency, their writing becomes more cohesive, coherent, and structurally complex.

Ferris and Hedgcock (2014) describe three broad stages of L2 writing development:

- Emerging Writers: At this stage, learners rely heavily on formulaic expressions and simple sentence structures. Their writing often shows limited coherence and reflects L1 influences.
- Developing Writers: Learners begin to demonstrate greater awareness of audience and genre. They can construct more complex sentences, organize ideas more logically, and engage in rudimentary revision.
- Proficient Writers: At this level, writers show control over a wide range of vocabulary and syntactic structures, use appropriate academic conventions, and revise their work effectively for clarity and coherence.

These stages are influenced by variables such as age of acquisition, instructional input, writing practice, and feedback. Researchers emphasize the need for differentiated pedagogical strategies aligned with learners' developmental levels.

2.2.3.3 Cognitive and linguistic challenges in L2 writing

Writing in an L2 is not merely a matter of translating thoughts from one language into another; it is a complex cognitive process involving multiple sub-skills. According to Kellogg (1996), writing involves planning, translating ideas into language, and reviewing—a process that becomes significantly more demanding when carried out in a non-native language.

One major challenge is limited linguistic repertoire. L2 writers often struggle with vocabulary limitations, idiomatic expressions, collocations, and syntactic variation (Hyland, 2003). These limitations can constrain idea development and affect coherence and fluency.

Cognitively, L2 writing requires greater working memory load. Learners must simultaneously manage content generation, language form, and mechanical correctness. According to Cumming (2001), L2 writers often devote so much attention to grammar and vocabulary that higher-order processes like idea elaboration and audience awareness suffer.

Another key issue is metalinguistic awareness. Learners with stronger awareness of language rules and structures tend to perform better in L2 writing tasks (Manchón, 2011). However, many L2 learners develop this awareness unevenly, often mastering surface-level accuracy before achieving rhetorical and discourse-level control.

Affective factors, such as writing anxiety and lack of confidence, also hinder L2 writing performance. Studies have shown that learners who perceive themselves as weak writers in English are less likely to take risks, revise their work, or seek feedback—all of which are critical for writing development (Horwitz, 2001).

2.2.3.4 Academic vs. conversational language acquisition (Cummins' BICS and CALP)

Jim Cummins (1979, 2000) introduced a crucial distinction between Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) to explain why many second language learners appear fluent in casual conversation yet struggle in academic contexts, especially in writing.

BICS refers to everyday conversational fluency. It typically develops within 1–2 years of language exposure and includes informal vocabulary, simple grammar, and context-embedded communication. CALP, by contrast, encompasses the abstract, decontextualized language used in academic discourse, such as essay writing, reading comprehension, and content-area instruction. Developing CALP can take 5–7 years, or longer for some learners (Cummins, 2000).

This distinction has significant implications for L2 writing instruction. Students who exhibit fluent speech may still lack the academic vocabulary, rhetorical structures, and critical thinking skills required for effective academic writing. Without targeted support, such students may be erroneously perceived as "underperforming" or "unmotivated."

Cummins' framework underscores the importance of explicit instruction in academic language, including genre awareness, disciplinary conventions, and cohesive devices. In writing classrooms, scaffolding strategies such as modeling, guided writing, and language-rich feedback can help bridge the gap between BICS and CALP.

L2 writing development is a multidimensional process shaped by a learner's L1, proficiency level, cognitive capacities, and exposure to academic discourse. While the L1 can serve as both a scaffold and a source of interference, its influence is undeniable in shaping writing strategies and rhetorical choices. Developmental models of writing reveal a progression from basic to advanced linguistic and organizational skills, though this progression is neither uniform nor automatic.

Learners face numerous challenges—including limited vocabulary, working memory demands, and affective barriers—that can inhibit writing fluency and accuracy. Cummins' distinction between conversational and academic language further highlights the need for intentional, scaffolded instruction that targets the unique demands of academic writing. Recognizing these factors is essential for educators aiming to design effective writing interventions and assessments for multilingual learners.

2.3 Integration of Language Skills

Language skills are inherently interconnected, forming a cohesive system in which no single skill can be taught or learned in isolation. Writing, as a critical component of language proficiency, is particularly well-suited to integration with other skills such as listening, speaking, and reading. An integrative approach to teaching writing not only enhances students' overall language competence but also fosters a more authentic and meaningful learning experience. This section discusses how writing can be effectively integrated with other language skills and highlights specific activities that achieve this goal.

2.3.1 Writing and listening

The integration of writing and listening skills can be achieved through activities that engage students in both receptive (listening) and productive (writing) tasks. As Kroll (1991) suggests, dictation exercises provide an effective means of integrating these two skills. In a typical activity, the teacher dictates a passage, and students are tasked with reconstructing the passage in written form using key vocabulary provided on the board. This exercise combines listening comprehension (as students process the dictated material) with writing practice (as they produce a written version of the passage).

Another common example is note-taking, a skill that is vital for academic and professional contexts. In a note-taking exercise, students listen to a lecture or audio recording and extract key points, which they record in writing. This activity not only develops their listening and writing skills but also enhances their ability to summarize, organize, and synthesize information (Rost, 2011). For instance, students can be asked to take notes during a lecture on a historical topic and

later use those notes to write a summary or an essay. This process reinforces their ability to transfer information from one skill domain to another (Goh, 2014).

Additionally, listening and writing can be integrated through interviews and discussions. Students may interview a peer or a guest speaker, actively listening to responses while jotting down key points. Later, they can use their notes to write a report or reflection on the interview. Such activities encourage active listening and provide a meaningful context for writing practice (Nation & Newton, 2009).

2.3.2 Writing and speaking

Writing and speaking are both productive skills, but their integration offers unique opportunities for reinforcing language learning. As Zamel (1982) explains, brainstorming sessions are an effective way to link speaking and writing. In such sessions, students collaborate in small groups, verbally sharing ideas about a given topic. While speaking, group members contribute diverse perspectives, and others document these ideas for later use in writing tasks. For instance, before drafting an essay on climate change, students can brainstorm causes and solutions in groups, creating a pool of ideas that they can draw from during the writing process.

Debates and discussions also offer opportunities for integrating speaking and writing. For example, students can participate in a classroom debate on a controversial topic. Following the debate, they may be asked to write an argumentative essay reflecting their stance, supported by points raised during the discussion (Harmer, 2007). This activity not only strengthens their persuasive writing skills but also helps them organize and articulate their thoughts more coherently.

Furthermore, role-playing activities can combine speaking and writing. For instance, students can assume roles in a fictional scenario—such as a town council meeting—and write speeches, proposals, or meeting minutes based on their discussions. This approach fosters creativity and ensures that both speaking and writing tasks are meaningfully integrated (Hyland, 2016).

2.3.3 Writing and reading

Reading and writing are closely linked skills, and their integration forms the foundation of literacy. Writing lessons often draw on reading materials as sources of content and inspiration. For example, students may read a short story or article and then write a summary, reflection, or analytical essay based on the text. This activity encourages students to engage deeply with the reading material while practicing writing skills such as paraphrasing, summarizing, and critical analysis (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996).

Another effective activity involves text reconstruction. Students are given a scrambled version of a text they have previously read and are tasked with reconstructing it in the correct order. This activity integrates reading comprehension with writing and helps students internalize text structure, coherence, and cohesion (Hirvela, 2004).

Moreover, reading can serve as a model for writing. Exposure to well-written texts allows students to observe and emulate effective writing techniques, such as the use of transitions, varied sentence structures, and rhetorical strategies. For instance, after reading a persuasive article on renewable energy, students can be guided to write their own persuasive essays, mirroring the techniques observed in the text. This approach not only enhances writing skills but also develops students' awareness of genre conventions and stylistic elements (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014).

2.3.4 Comprehensive integration of skills

In practice, writing lessons often address multiple language skills simultaneously. For example, a single lesson may incorporate listening, speaking, reading, vocabulary, and grammar alongside writing. Kroll (1991) provides an example of a holistic activity: the teacher dictates a passage to students, writes key vocabulary on the board, and asks students to reconstruct the passage using these words. This activity involves listening (students process the dictation), speaking (the teacher verbally delivers the material), reading (students read the vocabulary on the board), and writing (students reconstruct the passage). Additionally, such activities promote vocabulary acquisition and reinforce grammatical accuracy.

Another integrative activity is project-based learning, where students collaborate on a research project that requires them to read source materials, discuss findings in groups, take notes, and produce a written report or presentation. Such projects not only integrate multiple skills but also simulate real-world language use, making the learning process more authentic and engaging (Hyland, 2009).

2.3.5 Benefits of skill integration

The integration of writing with other language skills offers numerous pedagogical benefits. It promotes a holistic approach to language learning, ensuring that students develop a balanced set of competencies. By engaging with multiple skills in a single activity, students experience language as a dynamic and interconnected system, rather than a collection of isolated components. Moreover, integrative activities create meaningful contexts for language use, enhancing student motivation and engagement (Cumming, 2012).

However, successful integration requires careful planning and scaffolding by the instructor. Teachers must design activities that are appropriately challenging and aligned with students' proficiency levels. Additionally, explicit instruction and feedback are essential to ensure that students benefit from the integration of skills and do not become overwhelmed by the complexity of the tasks.

2.4 Assessment of Writing Performance

Assessing writing performance in second language contexts presents complex pedagogical and methodological challenges. As writing involves not only linguistic accuracy but also higher-order thinking skills such as organization, coherence, and audience awareness, effective assessment must account for both form and function. This section explores the major approaches to measuring writing performance, critically examines how code-switching may complicate such assessments, and contrasts standardized assessments with authentic writing tasks in educational settings.

2.4.1 Methods for measuring writing performance

The assessment of writing is commonly conducted using two main scoring approaches: holistic and analytic scoring. Holistic scoring evaluates a written text as a whole, typically assigning a single score based on overall impression (Weigle, 2002). This method allows for rapid assessment and can be useful in large-scale testing contexts. However, it may mask specific strengths or weaknesses in subcomponents such as grammar, coherence, or lexical choice.

In contrast, analytic scoring breaks down writing into discrete components—such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics—and assigns scores to each (Jacobs et al., 1981). This method provides detailed diagnostic feedback and is often used in classroom assessment and language learning research. Analytic rubrics enable more targeted instruction by highlighting specific areas for improvement (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014).

Rubrics—both holistic and analytic—are fundamental tools in writing assessment. Well-designed rubrics align with learning outcomes and offer transparency and consistency in evaluation. Andrade (2000) emphasized that when students understand the criteria against which they are assessed, they tend to perform better and engage more actively in the revision process.

However, challenges persist regarding inter-rater reliability, especially when assessing L2 writing. Raters may differ in their perceptions of what constitutes "acceptable" language, particularly when encountering non-standard forms or rhetorical styles influenced by the writer's first language. These issues become more pronounced when code-switching is involved, as explored in the following section.

2.4.2 How code-switching may complicate assessment

Code-switching—when students alternate between their L1 and L2 in writing—raises critical questions about validity and fairness in assessment. While code-switching can serve as a cognitive and rhetorical resource, particularly in the early stages of L2 development (Canagarajah, 2011), it often challenges standard assessment rubrics that assume monolingual norms of correctness.

Traditional writing rubrics typically penalize non-target language usage, regardless of its communicative effectiveness or contextual appropriateness. This poses a dilemma for teachers and assessors: should code-switching be treated as an error or as a legitimate linguistic strategy? According to Velasco and García (2014), bilingual students may strategically use their L1 to clarify, emphasize, or elaborate ideas. Penalizing such use without considering its rhetorical function may lead to assessments that do not accurately reflect students' communicative competence.

Furthermore, code-switching may influence raters' perceptions of fluency and coherence. As noted by Crawford and McLaren (2001), raters unfamiliar with the student's L1 may misinterpret code-switched segments as signs of incoherence, even when the underlying logic is sound. This introduces bias into the assessment process and may disadvantage bilingual writers.

Recent scholarship advocates for translanguaging-informed assessment models, which view bilingual practices as resources rather than obstacles (Garcia & Lin, 2017). These models emphasize the communicative intent and effectiveness of student writing over strict adherence to L2 purity. Nevertheless, implementing such approaches requires shifts in teacher training, rubric design, and institutional policy.

2.4.3 Standardized testing vs. authentic writing tasks

The debate between standardized testing and authentic assessment in writing has significant implications for pedagogical practice. Standardized tests, such as TOEFL or IELTS, typically rely on tightly controlled prompts, time constraints, and holistic or semi-analytic scoring procedures. While they offer comparability and objectivity, critics argue that such assessments often fail to capture the full range of students' writing abilities and can disadvantage learners from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Kunnan, 2000).

In contrast, authentic writing tasks—such as portfolios, journals, and project-based writing—offer more ecologically valid measures of writing competence. These tasks reflect real-world purposes and allow students to draw on a broader range of linguistic and cognitive resources, including code-switching and translanguaging practices (Hamp-Lyons & Condon, 2000).

Authentic assessments also permit drafting, revision, and reflection, aligning more closely with the recursive nature of writing.

Research by Hirvela and Belcher (2007) underscores the pedagogical benefits of authentic tasks: they increase student engagement, support individualized learning trajectories, and foster metacognitive awareness. However, such tasks require more time to assess and often lack the standardization necessary for large-scale accountability frameworks.

Hybrid models have emerged to reconcile the strengths of both approaches. For example, Andrade and Du (2007) suggest integrating performance-based assessments with standardized scoring criteria to ensure both validity and reliability. In multilingual contexts, this might involve allowing code-switching in formative tasks while maintaining L2-only expectations for summative evaluations, provided that students understand the criteria and pedagogical rationale.

Assessing writing performance in L2 classrooms is a complex endeavor that requires balancing objectivity, fairness, and pedagogical utility. While holistic and analytic scoring methods offer different advantages, the presence of code-switching challenges traditional notions of what constitutes "appropriate" writing. Ignoring the strategic and functional roles of L1 in student writing may result in biased or incomplete assessments. Likewise, the overreliance on standardized testing can obscure learners' authentic voice and creativity. A growing body of literature advocates for more nuanced and inclusive assessment practices that acknowledge the bilingual realities of many learners. In doing so, educators can better support students' writing development while maintaining standards of academic rigor and equity.

2.4.4 Writing skills tests

The assessment of writing skills is an essential component of language learning, enabling educators to gauge students' proficiency, track their progress, and tailor instruction to meet individual needs. Writing tests serve various purposes, such as determining general language proficiency, evaluating achievement of specific learning goals, identifying weaknesses, and assigning students to appropriate instructional levels. This literature review explores the key types of writing tests—proficiency tests, achievement tests, diagnostic tests, and placement

tests—drawing on both foundational and contemporary research to provide an in-depth analysis of their functions and applications.

2.4.4.1. Proficiency tests

Proficiency tests are designed to assess a learner's general ability to use the target language across multiple skills, including writing. These tests do not focus on specific course content or lessons but instead evaluate a student's overall language competence. As Harmer (2001) notes, proficiency tests provide a broad measure of language ability, commonly used for university admissions, job qualifications, or certification purposes. The International English Language Testing System (IELTS) and the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) are key examples of proficiency tests that include writing components, where candidates are assessed on their ability to produce coherent and structured written texts.

Proficiency tests provide a snapshot of a learner's overall language ability, including writing, without delving into specific areas of strength or weakness (Alderson, 2000). While they offer valuable information regarding a student's readiness for academic or professional settings, they do not provide detailed insights into specific writing challenges. This has led researchers to suggest that proficiency tests, though essential for general assessment, are more summative and less diagnostic in nature (Alderson, 2000; Shohamy, 2001).

2.4.4.2 Achievement tests

Achievement tests are focused on assessing learners' proficiency in relation to specific course content and instructional objectives. These tests evaluate how well students have mastered the material taught throughout a particular period or course. Achievement tests, therefore, are directly aligned with the curriculum and measure the effectiveness of teaching (O'Malley & Pierce, 1996).

In the context of writing, achievement tests may require students to demonstrate their understanding of writing concepts such as structure, coherence, argument development, and language use. These tests are typically administered at the end of a course or unit, providing a summative measure of a student's progress and achievement (Alderson, 2000). Achievement

tests are often seen as more focused and content-specific compared to proficiency tests, as they assess whether students have met the course objectives related to writing and language use (O'Malley & Pierce, 1996).

Achievement tests can also be administered at the conclusion of individual lessons or writing assignments to assess progress. Zeleke (2013) suggests that achievement tests at the lesson level allow educators to measure incremental learning and adjust teaching strategies accordingly, helping students refine their writing skills as they progress through the course. This focus on specific content enables achievement tests to provide more detailed feedback on students' writing performance than proficiency tests.

2.4.4.3 Diagnostic tests

Diagnostic tests are specifically designed to identify students' strengths and weaknesses in writing, offering valuable insights into areas that need further development. Unlike achievement tests, which measure the overall mastery of content, diagnostic tests are formative assessments that guide instructional decisions (Brown, 2004). These tests focus on pinpointing areas of difficulty, such as grammar, syntax, coherence, or vocabulary usage, and allow teachers to tailor subsequent lessons to address these weaknesses.

In writing instruction, diagnostic tests may include tasks such as error correction, sentence transformation, or gap-filling exercises, aimed at revealing specific areas where students struggle. These tests are valuable tools for identifying patterns of error and providing targeted interventions (Cohen, 1994). Brown (2004) emphasizes that diagnostic assessments are essential for understanding the unique needs of individual learners, allowing teachers to provide personalized support and feedback.

According to O'Malley and Pierce (1996), diagnostic tests are often conducted at the beginning of a course or unit to assess students’ baseline abilities. Teachers can use the results to design instructional activities that focus on addressing specific gaps in students’ writing skills. Regular diagnostic testing also provides a means to track progress over time and refine teaching approaches based on student needs.

2.4.4.4 Placement tests

Placement tests are designed to assess students' language proficiency to determine the most appropriate level or course for their abilities. These tests are often used to assign students to appropriate classes based on their writing and overall language skills. Placement tests are important in educational settings, ensuring that students are placed in a class that aligns with their current writing competence and providing them with an environment conducive to their learning needs (Alderson, 2000).

Placement tests typically measure general writing proficiency, such as the ability to organize ideas coherently, use correct grammar, and produce clear and readable texts. These tests help ensure that students are enrolled in courses that match their writing abilities, preventing them from being placed in classes that are either too advanced or too basic (Shohamy, 2001). In addition, placement tests provide a means of ensuring that students receive appropriate support throughout their learning process.

As Zeleke (2013) highlights, placement tests are crucial for optimizing student outcomes by ensuring that students are assigned to courses suited to their proficiency levels. These tests help educators make informed decisions about course placements and enable students to engage in learning experiences that match their writing capabilities.

In conclusion, writing skills tests are integral to language assessment, offering valuable information that informs teaching and learning processes. Proficiency tests provide a broad measure of overall language ability, achievement tests focus on specific learning goals, diagnostic tests identify weaknesses in students' writing, and placement tests ensure students are placed in appropriate learning environments. Each type of test serves a unique purpose, and their use should be guided by the specific goals of the language program. While proficiency and achievement tests offer summative evaluation, diagnostic and placement tests provide valuable formative insights that can guide instructional practice and improve learning outcomes. As research in language assessment continues to evolve, it is essential for educators to integrate multiple types of assessments to create a comprehensive and effective approach to teaching writing skills.

2.4.5 Approaches to scoring writing tests

Assessing writing skills in language learning requires effective and reliable scoring methods that can provide meaningful feedback to students and guide instructors in improving writing instruction. Three commonly used approaches for scoring writing tests include the error-count approach, the analytic approach, and the holistic approach. Each of these scoring approaches has distinct advantages and disadvantages, and their selection largely depends on the goals of assessment, time constraints, and the specific writing aspects being evaluated (Milanovic, 2020).

2.4.5.1 Error-count approach

The error-count approach (also known as the mechanical accuracy approach) focuses on counting the number of errors made by a student in specific areas of writing, such as grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary, and then deducting points based on the frequency of these errors. The approach is widely seen as an objective method since the number of errors is easily quantifiable. For example, an instructor may assign a value of 30% to a composition test, breaking it down into different components like content (7 points), grammar (8 points), mechanics (6 points), vocabulary (5 points), and organization (4 points). After reading the composition, the teacher counts errors in each area and subtracts a specified number of points accordingly, arriving at the final score (Zeleke, 2013; Sato & Loewen, 2020).

While the error-count approach offers the advantage of objectivity and straightforward implementation, it has significant limitations. First, it is criticized for not aligning with the true purpose of writing, which is communication. By concentrating on errors, this method risks discouraging students from writing freely and creatively, as they may become overly concerned with making mistakes (Kormos, 2021). Moreover, it fails to provide a holistic evaluation of the writing, and does not highlight areas where students may excel or need improvement beyond mechanical aspects. As Heaton (1990) points out, this approach can lead to negative consequences for students' motivation and their development as writers. Similarly, recent studies (Graham et al., 2020) emphasize that an over-reliance on error counting could detract from the broader communicative aims of writing instruction. In sum, while the error-count method may seem appealing in terms of its simplicity and objectivity, it does not adequately reflect the

complex nature of writing as a communicative skill and therefore is not recommended for comprehensive writing assessments.

2.4.5.2 Analytic approach

In contrast to the error-count method, the analytic approach evaluates writing by breaking it down into several distinct components, such as content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Each component is assigned a weight based on its importance, and the total score is derived by adding up the individual scores for each component. This approach allows evaluators to assess multiple aspects of writing performance and provides students with detailed feedback on specific areas of strength and areas needing improvement.

The analytic approach has several advantages. It promotes a more comprehensive evaluation of a student's writing skills by focusing on critical components such as coherence, organization, vocabulary usage, and grammatical accuracy (Weigle, 2018). It also encourages students to improve specific aspects of their writing, as they receive feedback on various criteria. Furthermore, because it dissects the writing into components, it enhances the reliability of scoring by offering a more structured framework for evaluation (Hughes, 2003; Tseng & Liou, 2021). This method allows for more specific feedback, which can be useful for both students and instructors in identifying areas for improvement.

However, the analytic approach is not without its drawbacks. One of the main criticisms is that it requires more time to administer and grade than other methods. Grading each component separately demands a more detailed and careful evaluation, which can be time-consuming, especially with large numbers of students (Harris & McCann, 2021). Additionally, some scholars argue that the method's emphasis on component scores might artificially separate the interconnected elements of writing, thereby creating a false impression that these elements can be independently evaluated without considering how they work together in the text (Weigle, 2018). This may lead to the halo effect, where one component score (such as grammar) influences the scores for other aspects (such as content or organization), even if these elements are not directly related. Another potential issue is that some analytic rubrics may use ambiguous, overly simplistic, or overlapping descriptors, which can lead to inconsistencies in scoring (Heaton, 1990; Knoch et al., 2022).

2.4.5.3 Holistic approach

The holistic approach to scoring writing is often referred to as the impressionistic approach, as it involves assigning a single score to a composition based on an overall impression of the student's writing. In this method, the evaluator reads the composition quickly and makes an intuitive judgment about the overall quality of the writing, without focusing on individual components or errors. The holistic approach is valued for its efficiency, as it requires less time and effort to score compared to both the error-count and analytic approaches (Cumming, 2014).

One of the primary strengths of the holistic approach is its ability to capture the overall communicative effectiveness of the writing. Since it considers the composition as a whole, this approach better aligns with the real-world function of writing, which is to convey meaning clearly and effectively. It allows evaluators to assess the general impression of the student's writing, including how well ideas are organized, expressed, and supported (Weigle, 2018). Additionally, the holistic approach can be beneficial for large-scale assessments where time is limited and quick scoring is necessary (Zhang & Kunnan, 2022).

However, the holistic approach is not without its limitations. One major drawback is that it does not provide detailed feedback on the student's specific strengths and weaknesses, making it difficult for both the instructor and the student to pinpoint areas that require further development (Graham et al., 2020). As a result, this approach can be less informative for students who are seeking to improve particular aspects of their writing. Furthermore, the holistic approach can be highly subjective, as scores may be influenced by factors such as the evaluator's mood or personal biases (Ferris & Hedgecock, 2005). In addition, there is a tendency for evaluators to assign higher scores to longer texts, even if the quality is similar to shorter compositions, leading to potential inconsistencies in scoring (Hughes, 2003; Lin & Hong, 2021).

Each of the three scoring approaches—error-count, analytic, and holistic—has distinct advantages and limitations. The error-count approach offers objectivity but fails to capture the true nature of writing as a communicative skill, often discouraging students from taking risks in their writing. The analytic approach provides a detailed evaluation of different aspects of writing, encouraging students to improve specific skills, but it can be time-consuming and may lead to a

fragmented view of writing. The holistic approach allows for a comprehensive assessment of the writing as a whole, but it lacks specificity and can be subject to evaluator bias.

In practice, the choice of scoring method should be based on the specific context and goals of the writing assessment. For instance, if the goal is to provide detailed feedback on various aspects of writing, the analytic approach may be more appropriate. However, for larger assessments or where time constraints are significant, the holistic approach may be more feasible. Ultimately, an effective writing assessment strategy may involve integrating elements of all three approaches to provide a balanced and comprehensive evaluation of students' writing abilities (Graham et al., 2020; Tseng & Liou, 2021).

2.5 Code-Switching: Definitions and Typologies

Code-switching constitutes a pivotal phenomenon within the fields of bilingualism and multilingualism, attracting sustained scholarly interest from linguists, educators, and cognitive scientists. It holds particular relevance in educational contexts, where learners frequently navigate between their first language and a second or foreign language, such as English. Far from being a unitary or simplistic behavior, code-switching encompasses a diverse array of linguistic practices that vary in form, function, and sociolinguistic context. A nuanced understanding of its definitions and typologies is indispensable for examining its implications on language development, classroom discourse, and student writing performance.

2.5.1 Definition of code-switching

Broadly defined, code-switching refers to the systematic alternation between two or more linguistic codes—typically distinct languages or dialects—within a single communicative event. Foundational scholarship by Gumperz (1982) conceptualizes code-switching as the juxtaposition of linguistic elements from multiple codes within the same conversation, deployed as a communicative resource to convey complex social meanings such as solidarity, authority, or emotional resonance. This perspective underscores the inherently contextual and interactional nature of code-switching, framing it as a strategic and adaptive linguistic behavior rather than a sign of deficiency or interference.

In a complementary vein, Myers-Scotton (1993) defines code-switching as the selection of lexical and syntactic forms from two distinct grammatical systems within or across discourse boundaries. Crucially, she distinguishes code-switching from borrowing: while borrowing typically involves the assimilation of isolated lexical items into the grammatical system of the host language, code-switching entails the alternation of larger, syntactically structured segments that preserve their original linguistic integrity. This distinction becomes particularly salient in the analysis of student writing, wherein features of both borrowing and switching may coexist and interact in complex ways.

Contemporary linguistic frameworks further differentiate code-switching from related phenomena such as code-mixing and translanguaging. Muysken (2000), for example, identifies code-mixing as the intra-sentential insertion of lexical or phrasal elements from another code, often characterized by its spontaneity and reduced syntactic integration. In contrast, García and Li Wei (2014) introduce the concept of *translanguaging* to describe the fluid, dynamic, and intentional deployment of an individual's entire linguistic repertoire in meaning-making processes. This reconceptualization challenges rigid separations between named languages and encourages a more holistic view of bilingual communication—one especially pertinent in contemporary classrooms that aim to foster inclusive and asset-based approaches to multilingualism.

2.5.2 Typologies of code-switching

Over the past several decades, scholars have proposed various typological frameworks to categorize the formal and functional manifestations of code-switching. Among the most influential is Poplack's (1980) tripartite classification, which distinguishes among three primary types:

a. Inter-sentential code-switching

This type involves language alternation across sentence or clause boundaries. For instance, a student may write, "I studied very hard. *Pero no entendía nada.*" Such switching presupposes a relatively high level of competence in both languages and is often associated with deliberate rhetorical or discursive strategies.

b. Intra-sentential code-switching

Occurring within a single sentence or clause, this type reflects a sophisticated level of grammatical integration and bilingual proficiency. An example might be: "She is *muy inteligente* and *trabaja muy duro.*" This form is syntactically complex and sensitive to the compatibility of grammatical structures across the languages involved.

c. Tag-switching

This involves the insertion of discourse markers, fillers, or interjections from one code into the utterance structure of another. For example: "You know, *eso es lo que pienso.*" Tag-switching is relatively less demanding syntactically and often reflects habitual discourse patterns in informal bilingual communication.

Poplack's typology remains particularly valuable for analyzing bilingual writing, where inter-sentential switching is often observed in preliminary drafts or informal genres, while intra-sentential switching may emerge as learners develop more advanced bilingual literacy practices.

Gumperz (1982) offers a sociolinguistic typology that further illuminates the functions of code-switching. He distinguishes between Situational Code-Switching, which arises in response to changes in the communicative context—such as shifting from teacher-student interaction to peer dialogue—and Metaphorical Code-Switching, which is prompted by changes in topic, tone, or social alignment, often signaling identity negotiation or relational positioning.

These categories enrich our understanding of how code-switching operates within the layered social dynamics of classroom interaction and writing.

In pedagogical contexts, Lin (2013) has advanced a functional typology that identifies distinct instructional uses of code-switching, including: Curriculum-Translational Code-Switching, employed by teachers to clarify content or explain difficult concepts; Classroom-Management Code-Switching, used to organize activities and maintain discipline; and Student-Initiated Code-Switching, which serves cognitive or affective purposes, such as reducing anxiety or compensating for lexical gaps.

Such typologies underscore the multifunctional and pedagogically instrumental nature of code-switching in academic settings, especially as a scaffolding mechanism in second language writing development.

The scholarly literature on code-switching reveals it to be a multifaceted and context-dependent linguistic practice, intricately tied to cognitive, social, and pedagogical dimensions of language use. Typologies such as those proposed by Poplack (1980), Gumperz (1982), and Lin (2013) provide robust analytical tools for examining the structural and functional dimensions of code-switching in both spoken and written discourse. At the same time, translanguaging theory offers a paradigmatic shift that encourages more inclusive and fluid conceptions of bilingual competence. For researchers and educators alike, a comprehensive understanding of the definitions and typologies of code-switching is foundational for investigating its impact on students' writing performance in English language classrooms and for designing pedagogical interventions that honor and support multilingual learners.

2.6 Code-Switching, Code-Mixing, Translation, L1 Use, and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts

Multilingualism has become a central feature of modern global communication, particularly in multilingual societies where multiple languages coexist and interact. Language phenomena such as code-switching**,** code-mixing**,** translation, and L1 use have garnered significant attention in sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and education. These phenomena serve as tools for enhancing communication, identity, and learning in multilingual settings. Although these practices share certain overlapping features, they each have distinct functions, contexts, and implications. This literature review seeks to provide a comprehensive analysis of these phenomena, drawing on recent studies to better understand their nature, applications, and implications in diverse multilingual contexts.

2.6.1 Code-Switching

Code-switching is defined as the alternation between two or more languages or dialects within a single conversation, sentence, or even phrase. It is a socially and contextually governed practice, with bilingual speakers adjusting their language use according to social, pragmatic, and

grammatical rules (Poplack, 1980; Gumperz, 1982). Research has traditionally distinguished two main types of code-switching: situational code-switching, which occurs in response to changes in context (e.g., moving from a formal to informal setting), and metaphorical code-switching, which is used to convey shifts in social meaning, such as signaling solidarity or authority (Gumperz, 1982).

Recent studies have expanded upon these early distinctions, incorporating findings from educational and sociocultural contexts. For instance, Norris and Ortega (2000) demonstrate that situational code-switching is common in multilingual classrooms, where teachers and students switch languages based on topic, task complexity, and student proficiency. Tariq and Khan (2019) provide further evidence that code-switching in educational settings is a tool for enhancing comprehension, fostering a more inclusive environment, and bridging gaps in understanding for bilingual learners. Poplack's (1980) research into intra-sentential code-switching, where speakers alternate between languages within a single sentence, highlights the sophisticated cognitive processes involved, demonstrating that bilingual speakers adhere to grammatical constraints even when switching.

The Matrix Language Frame (MLF) Model proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993) further refines our understanding of intra-sentential code-switching by distinguishing between the matrix language, which provides the grammatical structure, and the embedded language, which contributes lexical items. This model has been particularly influential in examining the structural rules that govern language mixing, showing that bilinguals apply complex grammatical frameworks when switching.

In the educational context, code-switching has been explored as a pedagogical tool. Ferguson (2003) notes that in bilingual classrooms, teachers often strategically employ code-switching to facilitate understanding, clarify difficult concepts, and encourage student engagement. In this sense, code-switching acts as a bridge between students' linguistic resources, fostering a more inclusive learning environment.

2.6.2 Code-Mixing

Code-mixing refers to the blending of linguistic elements from two or more languages within a single utterance, often without a significant change in context or social meaning. Unlike code-switching, which is typically governed by social context and pragmatic needs, code-mixing involves the integration of languages at a deeper level, including phonological, syntactic, and lexical elements (Muysken, 2000).

Recent typologies of code-mixing build on earlier models. Muysken (2000) outlines three main types of code-mixing: insertion, where elements of one language are embedded into another's structure; alternation, which involves switching between complete clauses or sentence structures; and congruent lexicalization, where both languages share common grammatical structures. This typology helps us better understand the linguistic complexity of code-mixing, illustrating the ways in which bilingual speakers combine languages creatively to express meaning.

In contemporary research, code-mixing is increasingly seen as a marker of linguistic innovation and identity, particularly in urban and cosmopolitan settings. García and Wei (2014) argue that code-mixing allows bilinguals to navigate multiple social worlds and assert their identity within multilingual communities. It serves as a tool for signaling belonging to specific cultural or social groups, and in some cases, it represents a marker of modernity and global citizenship.

However, code-mixing also raises concerns regarding language shift and the erosion of minority languages. Some linguists, such as Sankoff and Poplack (2019), view code-mixing as a sign of language weakening, particularly in post-colonial contexts where dominant languages exert pressure on local vernaculars. The tension between linguistic innovation and concerns about language purity continues to be a significant issue in the study of code-mixing.

2.6.3 Translation

Translation, unlike code-switching and code-mixing, is a deliberate and structured process that involves transferring meaning from a source language (SL) to a target language (TL). Translation seeks to maintain both linguistic fidelity and cultural equivalence, ensuring that the meaning

conveyed in the SL is accurately rendered in the TL, while also accounting for cultural nuances and contexts (Jakobson, 1959; Venuti, 1995).

Jakobson's (1959) seminal work introduced three types of translation: intralingual translation**,** which occurs within the same language; interlingual translation, between two languages; and intersemiotic translation, between verbal and non-verbal systems. Of particular relevance to bilingual education is interlingual translation, where the focus is often on equivalence—ensuring that meaning, both linguistically and culturally, is preserved in the transition from SL to TL. Venuti (1995) has further contributed to the field by discussing translation strategies such as foreignization and domestication, where the former aims to retain the foreignness of the original text, and the latter involves adapting the translation to fit the target culture.

In educational settings, translation is used as a tool for language learning, particularly for bilingual students. Cook (2001) suggests that translation serves as a cognitive scaffold for learners by providing a direct means of transferring complex concepts from L1 to L2, thus reducing cognitive load and enhancing comprehension. Kern (1994) warns, however, that over-reliance on translation can hinder the development of fluency in L2, emphasizing the need for balance in using L1 as a learning tool.

Translation also plays a critical role in cross-cultural communication, where it enables the transfer of ideas and knowledge across linguistic and cultural boundaries. However, Venuti (1995) cautions that translation is inherently biased by the translator's choices, which can shape how cultural narratives are understood in the target language.

2.6.4 L1 use in multilingual contexts

The use of a speaker's first language in multilingual contexts has undergone a paradigm shift in recent years. Historically, L1 use in second language acquisition (SLA) was seen as an obstacle to immersion, with monolingual pedagogical models prioritizing exclusive L2 use. However, more recent research has highlighted the cognitive and pedagogical benefits of L1 use in multilingual classrooms (Cook, 2001; Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009).

L1 use is now recognized as a resource for scaffolding learning, facilitating comprehension, and reducing cognitive load. Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain (2009) argue that L1 use can serve as an effective means of clarifying instructions, explaining abstract concepts, and fostering deeper understanding, particularly for learners with limited proficiency in the L2.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, L1 serves as a marker of cultural identity and resistance against linguistic marginalization. Fishman (1972) highlights how L1 use in multilingual communities can strengthen group solidarity, particularly for minority language speakers facing the dominance of a larger language. L1 use is also seen as a means of preserving linguistic diversity and resisting the pressures of language shift in contexts where minority languages are endangered.

2.6.5 Code-Switching and Translanguaging

Emerging scholarship on translanguaging has prompted a critical reexamination of traditional code-switching frameworks within second language research and pedagogy. Historically, code-switching has been conceptualized as the alternation between two distinct linguistic systems, often treated as separate and bounded entities (Poplack, 1980; Myers-Scotton, 1993). Within classroom contexts, this perspective has typically framed code-switching as a deliberate pedagogical strategy in which teachers or learners shift between L1 and L2 to facilitate comprehension, manage discourse, or scaffold learning (Macaro, 2014; Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009). While this view has contributed to a more flexible understanding of language use in education, it still operates within a paradigm that assumes clear boundaries between languages.

In contrast, the concept of translanguaging, as articulated by García and Li Wei (2014), challenges these assumptions by reconceptualizing bilingual language use as fluid, dynamic, and integrated. From a translanguaging perspective, bilingual individuals do not simply switch between separate language systems; rather, they draw from a unified linguistic repertoire to construct meaning, negotiate identity, and accomplish communicative goals. This perspective suggests that what has traditionally been labeled as code-switching may, in fact, reflect a more natural and cognitively coherent process of meaning-making that transcends rigid linguistic

boundaries. In this sense, translanguaging shifts the focus from language separation to language integration, emphasizing the functional and strategic use of all available linguistic resources.

This reconceptualization has important implications for language teaching and learning. It challenges monolingual ideologies that privilege strict separation of languages in educational settings and instead promotes a more inclusive view that recognizes learners' full linguistic repertoires as valuable assets (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Within this framework, the use of L1 is not seen as interference or a compensatory mechanism, but as an integral component of bilingual cognition and learning. As a result, translanguaging pedagogies encourage flexible language practices that support deeper understanding, critical thinking, and learner engagement.

Applied to writing, translanguaging expands traditional notions of what constitutes acceptable academic language use. Conventional approaches to L2 writing often emphasize strict adherence to the target language, positioning deviations as errors or deficiencies. However, from a translanguaging perspective, the use of multiple linguistic resources can enhance idea generation, organization, and expression. By allowing learners to draw on their L1 during planning, drafting, or revising stages, educators can support more complex cognitive processing and facilitate the development of richer and more coherent texts (Canagarajah, 2011; García & Li Wei, 2014). This approach aligns with research suggesting that bilingual writers benefit from accessing their full linguistic repertoire when engaging in higher-order writing tasks.

At the same time, it is important to distinguish between the theoretical scope of translanguaging and the more operationalized concept of code-switching in classroom research. While translanguaging offers a comprehensive framework for understanding bilingual language practices, it can be more difficult to define, measure, and implement systematically in empirical studies. Code-switching, by contrast, remains a more clearly identifiable and manageable construct for classroom-based investigation, particularly in contexts where instructional practices are structured and outcomes need to be assessed. For this reason, many studies—including the present one—continue to adopt code-switching as the primary analytical lens, while acknowledging the broader insights offered by translanguaging theory.

In multilingual contexts such as Ethiopia, where classrooms often include speakers of multiple first languages and where English functions as a common medium of instruction, the practical application of translanguaging may be constrained by linguistic diversity and policy considerations. In such settings, code-switching provides a more feasible pedagogical approach, allowing for selective and strategic use of L1 where appropriate. Nevertheless, the theoretical contributions of translanguaging remain valuable, as they encourage educators to move beyond rigid language boundaries and to consider more inclusive and flexible approaches to language use in learning.

The growing body of research on translanguaging enriches the understanding of bilingualism and challenges traditional assumptions underlying code-switching frameworks. Rather than viewing the two as mutually exclusive, they can be seen as complementary perspectives: code-switching offers a practical and researchable model of language alternation in classrooms, while translanguaging provides a broader theoretical lens that captures the complexity and fluidity of multilingual meaning-making. In the context of the present study, the focus on code-switching is particularly appropriate for both methodological and contextual reasons. Unlike translanguaging, which is often difficult to delimit and operationalize in controlled research settings, code-switching allows for clearer identification, implementation, and measurement of instructional practices. This is especially important in a quasi-experimental design that seeks to compare outcomes across defined instructional approaches. Furthermore, in multilingual contexts such as Ethiopia—where classrooms may include speakers of multiple first languages and where English serves as a common instructional medium—the structured and selective use of code-switching is more feasible than broader translanguaging practices. As such, examining code-switching provides a more practical and empirically grounded means of investigating the role of L1 in L2 writing instruction, while still remaining informed by the broader insights of translanguaging theory.

2.6.6 Comparative analysis

While code-switching**,** code-mixing**,** translation, and L1 use each serve distinct functions, they often intersect in multilingual contexts. Code-switching and code-mixing are informal, spontaneous practices often used for social signaling, identity construction, and conversational

fluency. Translation, by contrast, is a formalized, deliberate process focused on transferring meaning across languages. L1 use, as both a cognitive tool and cultural marker, underpins the other phenomena, providing a foundation for bilingual communication.

Empirical studies highlight the complementary roles of these phenomena. Auer (1998) demonstrates that code-switching and code-mixing are frequently used in informal interactions to maintain rapport and navigate complex social dynamics. On the other hand, translation and L1 use are more common in educational settings, where they aid comprehension, support language learning, and preserve linguistic diversity.

2.7 Theoretical Frameworks of Code-Switching

The phenomenon of code-switching, broadly defined as the alternation between two or more languages or language varieties within a single discourse or communicative event, has been the subject of extensive theoretical inquiry within sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and educational linguistics. In multilingual educational settings, particularly English language classrooms, code-switching is not merely a linguistic occurrence but a pedagogical and cognitive strategy that can significantly influence students' language development and academic performance, especially in writing. This review examines key theoretical frameworks that underpin the study of code-switching, with an emphasis on their relevance to language learning and writing performance in L2 contexts.

One of the foundational perspectives on code-switching is rooted in interactional sociolinguistics, as developed by Gumperz (1982). He conceptualized code-switching as a contextualization cue, used by speakers to negotiate meaning, signal social identity, and manage interpersonal relationships within discourse. Gumperz distinguished between situational code-switching, where language choice changes in response to shifts in the physical or social setting, and metaphorical code-switching, where the switch serves to convey nuances of tone, emphasis, or solidarity. Within the classroom, such switches often function as subtle markers of alignment or clarification. From this perspective, code-switching can be understood as a communicative resource, not a linguistic deficiency, which facilitates mutual understanding between students

and teachers, particularly when dealing with abstract or cognitively demanding content, such as academic writing tasks.

A complementary sociolinguistic theory is Myers-Scotton's (1993) Markedness Model, which explains language choice as a function of social and psychological motivations. In her framework, speakers make either unmarked or marked language choices based on expected social norms or the desire to redefine social relationships. Code-switching, in this model, becomes a strategic act where speakers select linguistic codes to index authority, solidarity, resistance, or accommodation. In classroom contexts, students may use their first language during writing preparation or peer collaboration to manage power dynamics, express uncertainty, or seek support. Understanding such motivations is essential for educators seeking to interpret students' linguistic behaviors and foster supportive environments for L2 writing development.

From a structural standpoint, Poplack's (1980) Constraint Theory offers a linguistic explanation of where and how code-switching occurs within sentences. She proposed two principal constraints: the *free morpheme constraint*, which prohibits switching between a bound morpheme and a free morpheme, and the *equivalence constraint*, which permits switching only where the syntactic structures of both languages align. Although primarily based on spoken data, this theory has implications for writing, particularly among students who internalize grammatical rules differently across languages. Code-switching in writing may reflect syntactic compatibility or incompatibility between the L1 and L2, and thus inform the types of errors or hybrid constructions students produce. This perspective contributes to understanding how language structures influence bilingual composition processes.

In addition to sociolinguistic and structural approaches, psycholinguistic models provide insight into the cognitive mechanisms underlying code-switching. Grosjean's (2001) Bilingual Processing Model suggests that bilinguals operate in a "language mode" continuum, where one or both languages may be activated depending on the communicative context. In situations where both languages are active, such as in bilingual classrooms, code-switching becomes a natural outcome of cognitive flexibility and linguistic accessibility. In writing, this means that students may draw upon L1 resources during drafting or planning stages, either consciously or subconsciously, to organize ideas, access vocabulary, or generate content. Far from indicating

linguistic confusion, such behavior may reflect strategic use of linguistic repertoires to meet communicative goals.

A broader and more integrative framework is provided by Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory, which emphasizes the role of social interaction and cultural tools, including language, in cognitive development. Central to this theory is the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), wherein learners achieve higher levels of performance through scaffolded interaction with more knowledgeable others. Code-switching, in this context, can be seen as a mediational tool that supports learning within the ZPD. For example, students may revert to their L1 to self-regulate their thinking, seek clarification, or engage in collaborative problem-solving during writing tasks. This theoretical perspective validates the pedagogical use of code-switching as a means of reducing cognitive load and enhancing student agency in second language writing.

Closely aligned with Vygotskian theory is the more recent development of translanguaging theory, notably articulated by García (2009) and Li Wei (2018). Translanguaging moves beyond traditional notions of code-switching by positing that bilinguals do not compartmentalize their languages but instead utilize an integrated linguistic repertoire to make meaning. In this view, classroom language practices that allow students to fluidly alternate between languages are not signs of linguistic interference but indicators of complex cognitive and discursive competence. For writing instruction, a translanguaging pedagogy encourages students to brainstorm, draft, or annotate in their L1 while composing in the L2, thereby leveraging all available linguistic resources to support academic expression and conceptual understanding.

Cummins' (1979; 1981) Interdependence Hypothesis and Dual Iceberg Model offer a theoretical basis for understanding cross-linguistic transfer in bilingual writing. According to Cummins, cognitive and academic skills developed in the L1 can positively transfer to the L2, provided that there is adequate exposure and motivation. His models suggest that although surface features of different languages may vary, the underlying proficiency and literacy skills are shared. This theoretical stance underscores the potential benefits of code-switching in the writing process, as it enables students to apply L1 strategies—such as outlining, argumentation, or summarization—to their L2 writing tasks. When supported by appropriate pedagogy, such transfer can enhance both the fluency and complexity of student writing.

The theoretical literature on code-switching reveals it to be a multifaceted phenomenon with cognitive, social, and linguistic dimensions. From sociolinguistic interpretations of identity and discourse management to psycholinguistic models of bilingual processing and sociocultural views of mediated learning, each framework contributes to a deeper understanding of how and why students alternate between languages. Importantly, these theories converge on the notion that code-switching, when strategically employed, can serve as a facilitative mechanism in the development of L2 writing skills. Future research and pedagogical practice would benefit from embracing these theoretical insights to foster inclusive and linguistically responsive writing instruction in multilingual classrooms

2.8 Reasons for Using L1 in L2 Classrooms

The role of L1 in L2 classrooms has been a subject of ongoing debate, with many arguing for or against its use in language learning environments. In his review on the role of L1 in foreign language learning, Nation (2003) presents several compelling reasons for the use of L1 by learners in L2 classrooms. These reasons provide insight into the practical and emotional factors that influence language acquisition in the classroom.

2.8.1 Naturalness and comfort in communication

One of the primary reasons for the use of L1 in L2 classrooms is that it is a more natural mode of communication for learners. Nation (2003) points out that learners tend to revert to their L1 because they are more familiar with it and feel more comfortable using it. This natural inclination to use the L1 helps ease communication, especially when learners are still developing proficiency in the L2. As a result, students can more easily express their ideas and understand others, particularly when the subject matter is complex or requires a higher level of understanding that may not yet be achievable in the L2.

The natural use of L1 can foster greater student participation in the classroom, especially for beginners or students with limited L2 proficiency. Learners can express their thoughts and interact with their peers more freely in their L1, which is important for creating a positive and interactive classroom environment.

2.8.2 Ease of communication and effectiveness

Another significant reason for using L1 in L2 classrooms is that it facilitates more effective communication. Communication in L1 is often quicker and more efficient, enabling students to convey ideas clearly without the constraint of struggling with the L2. Macaro (1997) emphasizes that when students are able to use their L1, they can focus more on the content of the message rather than being hindered by linguistic challenges in the L2. This can lead to clearer understanding, reducing the cognitive load that might arise from attempting to explain complex ideas in the target language.

Furthermore, using the L1 allows teachers to explain difficult concepts more clearly, which can be particularly important when introducing abstract or advanced topics. This use of L1 as a scaffolding tool can help bridge the gap in understanding and allow students to engage with the lesson material more effectively.

2.8.3 Reducing emotional load

A third reason for permitting L1 in L2 classrooms is the emotional aspect of language learning. Nation (2003) highlights that using the L2 can sometimes create a psychological barrier, especially for shy learners or those who feel insecure about their language abilities. For many students, the L2 can be intimidating, and the fear of making mistakes can lead to anxiety and a reluctance to participate. By allowing students to use their L1 when necessary, teachers can help reduce the emotional burden associated with language learning.

This reduction in emotional load can lead to a more supportive and comfortable learning environment, where students feel safe enough to experiment with language use. According to Lee (2010)**,** even when teachers require students to use only the L2 in the classroom, students often continue to rely on their L1 mentally, which may indicate that using the L1 is a more comfortable and emotionally safe mode of processing information. This suggests that incorporating L1 strategically in the classroom could provide students with the emotional security necessary to engage in more active learning.

2.8.4 Social and educational context

The use of L1 in L2 classrooms also plays a significant role in the social and educational context. When students share the same L1, they can use it as a tool for social bonding and building rapport with their peers. Code-switching can be seen as a natural way for students to connect with one another and express their thoughts, making the classroom environment more interactive and supportive. Macaro (1997) argues that CS can help ease the pressure of navigating the L2 and facilitate better social interactions among students.

Moreover, the social dimension of language learning cannot be ignored. In a study conducted by Yinager (2018**),** it was found that students and teachers in English-medium classrooms in Ethiopia expressed favorable attitudes towards the use of Amharic, a local language, in the classroom. The study showed that despite the requirement to use English in academic settings, both students and teachers acknowledged the value of using Amharic for social interaction and to clarify difficult concepts. This supports the idea that L1 can help students navigate their social and academic challenges in L2 environments, contributing to better overall learning experiences.

2.8.5 Cognitive processing and L2 learning

Even in classrooms where the use of L2 is emphasized, students often engage in cognitive processing in their L1, particularly when they encounter difficult concepts or unfamiliar vocabulary. Lee (2010) notes that regardless of the teachers' efforts to promote L2-only environments, learners tend to internally process new information in their L1. This is a natural cognitive strategy, as students are more proficient in their L1 and thus can use it as a mental tool to process and organize new linguistic information in the L2. The presence of L1 in the classroom, therefore, reflects the cognitive reality of language learning, where learners often rely on their L1 to make sense of the L2.

The role of L1 in the L2 classroom is multifaceted, encompassing emotional**,** social**,** cognitive**,** and practical dimensions of learning. While L2 immersion is important for language acquisition, the strategic use of L1 can help address some of the challenges learners face, such as communication difficulties, emotional anxiety, and cognitive overload. Research suggests that a balanced approach, where L1 is used judiciously to support learning, can create a more effective

and supportive classroom environment. Therefore, it is crucial for language educators to recognize the benefits of L1 and incorporate it thoughtfully in L2 instruction, based on the needs and proficiency levels of the learners.

2.9 The Role of L1 in L2 Classrooms

The use of L1 in L2 classrooms has long been a subject of pedagogical and theoretical debate. While some educators advocate for exclusive L2 use to foster immersion and maximize exposure, others argue for a balanced, strategic use of L1, particularly to support learners at initial stages of acquisition. This section synthesizes theoretical perspectives and empirical research to present a comprehensive view of the effects and roles of L1 in L2 classrooms, including affective, cognitive, instructional, and classroom management dimensions.

2.9.1 Theoretical perspectives and the foreign language classroom

The foreign language (FL) classroom, according to Macaro (1997), is a unique and often disorienting space where learners navigate unfamiliar linguistic and social dynamics. He characterizes it as a "strange" environment in which both students and teachers may grapple with limited proficiency in the L2. In such contexts, strategic use of L1 can serve as a valuable tool to alleviate this strangeness, reduce dependence, and provide scaffolding. Rather than repress the shared linguistic background of the learners, Macaro advocates for a compromised approach that integrates L1 to support instructional goals while still prioritizing L2 exposure.

2.9.2 Affective and emotional dimensions

Emotional comfort and psychological readiness are crucial components of successful language acquisition. Harbord (1992) contends that L1 use can help build rapport between teacher and student, ease anxiety, and establish a secure classroom environment. This is particularly important for beginner-level learners who may feel overwhelmed by constant L2 input. However, Harbord also warns that over-reliance on the L1 can limit valuable opportunities for L2 practice.

In contrast, Auerbach (1993) emphasizes the affective benefits of L1 use in reducing learners' emotional barriers—often referred to as affective filters. These filters, such as fear or lack of confidence, can significantly impede language acquisition. By lowering these barriers through occasional L1 use, students may become more willing to take linguistic risks, engage more deeply in learning tasks, and develop positive attitudes toward the L2.

2.9.3 Cognitive and instructional benefits

From a cognitive standpoint, the impact of L1 use in L2 learning is multifaceted. Bakhtiari (2014) argues that L1 integration does not significantly outperform English-only instruction in promoting L2 proficiency. His findings suggest that CS (code-switching) does not necessarily yield superior outcomes compared to EO environments. This view supports a monolingual approach, emphasizing maximum L2 input as the most efficient path to language acquisition.

In contrast, Garza and Nava (2005) report that CS can be an effective pedagogical tool, particularly for bilingual students and those experiencing difficulties with L2 acquisition. For these learners, CS provides a cognitive bridge between the known (L1) and the unknown (L2), helping them make connections and construct new linguistic knowledge.

Spice (2018) similarly supports the use of CS in early language learning stages. He argues that CS can facilitate comprehension and internalization of basic linguistic structures. However, Spice also cautions that the pedagogical utility of CS diminishes as learners advance. As proficiency increases, continued reliance on L1 may become counterproductive, limiting opportunities for immersive L2 use and hindering the development of autonomous language skills.

2.9.4 Vocabulary acquisition and code-switching

Vocabulary development is a core component of L2 acquisition, and code-switching has been shown to play a significant role in this domain. Lee (2010), in a study on Korean EFL learners, demonstrated that teacher-led CS significantly improved vocabulary retention, especially among younger learners. His findings suggest that CS provides a cognitive anchor for learners, allowing

them to link new L2 vocabulary to existing L1 knowledge, thus enhancing recall and comprehension.

Lee (2010) also found that CS was particularly effective in teaching abstract vocabulary, which often lacks direct contextual cues. For younger learners, CS facilitated understanding of such terms more effectively than EO instruction. However, adult learners showed only modest gains from CS, indicating that age and developmental factors may influence the efficacy of L1 in vocabulary instruction.

2.9.5 Classroom management and instructional clarity

L1 serves practical functions in classroom management and instructional delivery. Nation (2003) underscores the importance of using the L2 for classroom routines—such as giving directions, managing behavior, and explaining tasks—as this provides additional input and reinforces functional L2 usage. However, in instances where students struggle to understand instructions, brief use of L1 can ensure clarity, maintain lesson flow, and prevent confusion.

This strategic alternation between L1 and L2 supports both linguistic immersion and instructional efficiency. It highlights the teacher's role in navigating when and how to deploy the L1 to support comprehension without undermining L2 goals.

2.9.6 Contextual factors and instructional balance

The effectiveness of L1 use is highly context-dependent. Variables such as learners' proficiency levels, age, exposure to L2 outside the classroom, and specific learning objectives all play a role in determining the appropriateness of L1 integration. In contexts where L2 exposure is minimal outside the classroom, limited and strategic use of L1 may be necessary to ensure comprehension and maintain student engagement.

Macaro (1997) and Nation (2003) both argue for a flexible, balanced approach that incorporates L1 where pedagogically justified. Such an approach acknowledges the complex realities of language learning, especially for beginners, while maintaining a focus on fostering L2 autonomy over time.

2.9.7 Risks of overusing the L1

Despite its benefits, excessive reliance on the L1 poses risks. Overuse can reduce learners' exposure to the L2, diminish spontaneous use of the target language, and limit the development of essential communicative strategies. Nation (2003) cautions that while the L1 can be a helpful tool, its use must be carefully calibrated to avoid dependency.

When the L1 is used too frequently, learners may default to translation-based strategies rather than developing a deep understanding of L2 structures and functions. This can inhibit long-term language acquisition and hinder learners' ability to operate effectively in authentic L2 environments.

To optimize language learning, educators should adopt a principled, context-sensitive approach to L1 use. This involves using L1 strategically—for scaffolding, clarification, and emotional support—particularly in the early stages of instruction. As learners progress, L1 use should be gradually reduced to foster independence and L2 fluency.

Effective scaffolding techniques may include translating complex terms, explaining grammar rules, or providing cultural context in the L1. These strategies should be temporary, with the ultimate goal of transitioning learners to exclusive L2 use. By recognizing both the affordances and limitations of L1, educators can create a classroom environment that is both supportive and linguistically rich.

To sum up, **t**he role of L1 in L2 classrooms is multifaceted, involving emotional, cognitive, instructional, and practical considerations. Research supports the judicious use of L1 to reduce anxiety, enhance comprehension, support vocabulary acquisition, and facilitate classroom management. However, over-reliance on L1 can impede immersion and limit opportunities for authentic L2 practice. Therefore, a balanced, strategic approach—tailored to learners' individual needs and learning contexts—is essential for maximizing the benefits of L1 without undermining L2 acquisition. By thoughtfully integrating L1 where appropriate and progressively encouraging greater L2 use, educators can foster a more effective, inclusive, and empowering language learning environment.

2.10 Impacts of Code-Switching on Writing Performance

Code-switching—alternating between two or more languages within a communicative act—has been the subject of considerable scholarly interest in relation to L2 development. While it has traditionally been viewed with skepticism in academic contexts, recent research increasingly highlights its nuanced and context-dependent role in language learning and literacy development. This section explores empirical findings on how code-switching influences writing performance in terms of grammar, cohesion, organization, and vocabulary; differences between monolingual and bilingual writers; the distinction between short-term and long-term impacts; and its influence on language accuracy, fluency, and complexity.

2.10.1 Empirical studies on the impact of code-switching on writing skills

Empirical studies have revealed both supportive and disruptive roles of code-switching in student writing, particularly in English as a Second Language (ESL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings. One of the central arguments in favor of code-switching is its role as a cognitive and linguistic scaffold. In contexts where learners have limited proficiency in L2, code-switching allows them to maintain the flow of written communication, bridging lexical or conceptual gaps (Canagarajah, 2011; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). For instance, by inserting L1 lexical items or structures, students can concentrate on content generation without being paralyzed by L2 limitations.

Research by García and Kano (2014) found that when learners were permitted to draw on both L1 and L2 in their writing processes, their overall cohesion and organization improved, as they could better plan, brainstorm, and revise their ideas. Similarly, studies by Velasco and García (2014) demonstrated that bilingual students often use code-switching strategically in their writing, particularly for emphasizing a point, injecting personal voice, or clarifying meaning.

However, code-switching can also present challenges to grammatical accuracy and syntactic cohesion, especially among less proficient writers. According to Ellis (2008), inappropriate or inconsistent switches may disrupt the flow and coherence of a text, resulting in fragmented or stylistically incongruent writing. This risk is particularly evident when students switch codes mid-sentence without appropriate syntactic integration (Poplack, 1980).

2.10.2 Differences between monolingual and bilingual writers

Bilingual writers often differ from monolinguals not only in their linguistic repertoire but also in their cognitive and rhetorical strategies. Bilingual students tend to rely on translanguaging practices—the fluid use of linguistic resources across language boundaries—whereas monolinguals typically operate within a single linguistic system (Creese & Blackledge, 2010).

Several studies (e.g., Durgunoğlu, 2002; Cummins, 2005) show that bilingual learners who are allowed to use both languages in prewriting activities perform better on complex writing tasks than those constrained to use L2 exclusively. These students benefit from deeper cognitive engagement, increased lexical access, and stronger organizational strategies drawn from their L1. In contrast, monolinguals may excel in surface-level linguistic accuracy but may not show the same strategic flexibility in idea development.

Moreover, research by Lee and Schallert (2008) suggests that bilingual learners who are permitted to code-switch during writing demonstrate greater originality and topic development, although they may produce more grammatical errors than monolingual peers. These findings support the view that bilingual writing performance should not be judged solely on monolingual norms of correctness but understood in terms of rhetorical and communicative effectiveness.

2.10.3 Short-term vs. long-term effects of code-switching

In the short term, code-switching can enhance learners' fluency and confidence by reducing cognitive load during the composing process. Storch and Aldosari (2013) observed that L2 writers who engaged in code-switching while planning and drafting essays produced longer and more elaborate texts. Code-switching enabled them to articulate complex ideas more freely and to keep momentum in their writing.

In the long term, however, the relationship is more nuanced. While initial reliance on L1 support may facilitate early writing development, excessive or uncontrolled code-switching can potentially fossilize certain errors or inhibit full L2 immersion (Macaro, 2009). The long-term benefits of code-switching appear to be maximized when it is used strategically and gradually reduced as learners gain proficiency.

Tian and Macaro (2012) advocate a "pedagogic code-switching" model, where learners transition from L1-dependent strategies to full L2 control through carefully scaffolded writing activities. Longitudinal studies suggest that students who follow this trajectory often outperform peers who either avoid L1 entirely or overuse it without structure.

2.10.4 Impact on accuracy, fluency, and complexity

Three key dimensions of writing performance—accuracy, fluency, and complexity—have been central to evaluating the effects of code-switching. Accuracy refers to the correct use of grammatical, lexical, and syntactic structures. Excessive code-switching, particularly by novice learners, may lower accuracy as students bypass L2 structures they have not yet mastered. However, when used selectively, it can help students express complex ideas without grammatical breakdowns (Ellis & Yuan, 2004). Fluency refers to the flow, coherence, and continuity of writing. Multiple studies (e.g., Brooks-Lewis, 2009; Levine, 2011) report that students who code-switch while drafting demonstrate higher fluency, as they are less likely to interrupt the writing process due to lexical or syntactic hesitation. Complexity refers to the range and sophistication of linguistic structures used. Code-switching may support complexity by enabling access to more nuanced or culturally embedded concepts (Martin-Beltrán, 2010). However, if students over-rely on L1 phrases without attempting equivalent L2 constructions, complexity in the target language may stagnate.

Balanced and reflective code-switching, therefore, can support L2 writing by enabling learners to express complex content and maintain fluency while gradually improving accuracy through feedback and targeted instruction.

The effects of code-switching on L2 writing performance are multifaceted and depend on learner proficiency, instructional context, and purpose of writing. Empirical research suggests that code-switching can facilitate cohesion, content development, and fluency, particularly during early stages of writing development. Bilingual learners, when compared with monolinguals, exhibit unique advantages in strategic use of language and idea generation, although this may come at the expense of grammatical precision. While short-term use of code-switching supports writing fluency and motivation, its long-term effectiveness depends on structured pedagogical guidance

that gradually transitions learners toward full L2 proficiency. Ultimately, code-switching, when recognized as a legitimate communicative resource rather than a deficiency, can play a valuable role in enhancing L2 writing performance

2.11 Extent of L1 Use in L2 Classrooms

The extent of L1 use in L2 classrooms has been a point of extensive research and debate. While the primary goal in L2 education is to develop proficiency in the target language, the role of L1 is not always clear-cut. The amount of L1 used in L2 classrooms varies across different educational settings, teacher philosophies, and student needs. Factors such as the learners' proficiency levels, the specific language being taught, the nature of the content, and the classroom environment influence the extent of L1 use in language learning. This section reviews the literature on the extent of L1 use in L2 classrooms, examining various perspectives and providing evidence from research.

2.11.1 Theoretical perspectives on L1 use in L2 education

Theories of language acquisition have long debated the role of L1 in the process of learning an L2. Krashen's (1982) input hypothesis, for instance, advocates for full immersion in the target language, suggesting that exposure to comprehensible input in the L2 (without interference from L1) is crucial for language acquisition. According to this view, the more the learner is exposed to the target language, the greater the likelihood of successful language development.

However, Swain's (1985) output hypothesis, along with the sociocultural theory of language learning (Vygotsky, 1978), posits that the interaction between learners and their environment, including the use of their L1, can facilitate L2 acquisition. Swain emphasizes the importance of producing language (output) in the learning process, which may involve code-switching between L1 and L2 in certain contexts, especially for complex tasks or in lower proficiency stages. These theoretical perspectives suggest that L1 can play an important supporting role, depending on the learners' needs and the context of the classroom.

2.11.2 Empirical evidence on L1 use in the classroom

Empirical studies have highlighted varying degrees of L1 use in L2 classrooms, with some research advocating for limited L1 use and others arguing for its strategic inclusion in specific contexts.

Macaro (1997) conducted a study on the extent of L1 use in L2 classrooms and found that, while immersion in the L2 is essential for language acquisition, L1 can play an important role in clarifying difficult concepts, especially when students are at the beginner or intermediate level. In classrooms where L2 input is overwhelmingly dominant, students may still use L1 during peer interactions or group work to ensure clarity, particularly when the L2 level of proficiency is not sufficient for effective communication.

In a similar vein, López & McNeil (2018) examined code-switching in Spanish-English bilingual classrooms and found that students used L1 when faced with communication breakdowns in the L2. Teachers also used L1 in these classrooms to provide clear instructions and explanations. The study suggests that L1 can be a strategic tool to aid comprehension and foster social interaction among learners, particularly in mixed-proficiency classrooms.

2.11.3 Learners' proficiency and L1 use

The proficiency level of L2 learners plays a critical role in determining the extent to which L1 is used in the classroom. In early stages of language learning, when students have limited vocabulary and grammar in the L2, L1 becomes a valuable resource for both teachers and students. Auerbach (1993) conducted research that showed when teachers allowed L1 use in the classroom, learners were able to develop their L2 competence more effectively. In particular, students could better understand complex instructions and were more likely to feel comfortable engaging with the material.

Cook (2001) found that, in the initial stages of language acquisition, L1 is often used by both teachers and students to aid comprehension and to build connections between L2 vocabulary and concepts. As learners progress in their language acquisition, they begin to rely less on L1 for communication and more on the target language.

On the other hand, as Spice (2018) notes, once learners reach higher levels of language proficiency, the need for L1 in the classroom typically decreases. At this point, learners are able to use the L2 more confidently and effectively without frequent recourse to the L1, thus allowing them to immerse themselves more fully in the L2. This shift reflects the natural progression in language learning, where L2 becomes the primary medium of instruction and interaction.

2.11.4 Teacher-driven use of L1

The extent to which teachers permit or encourage L1 use is another significant factor in determining its presence in the classroom. Teachers who strictly follow an immersion-based approach may limit L1 use, adhering to the philosophy that the more exposure learners have to the L2, the faster their proficiency will grow. Nation (2003), however, suggests that teachers should adopt a more flexible approach, allowing L1 use when it enhances understanding or reduces anxiety for students. For example, when learners struggle with complex grammar explanations or need quick clarification of unfamiliar vocabulary, teachers may switch to L1 to ensure clarity.

Research by Lee (2010) on teacher code-switching in Korean L2 classrooms found that teachers used L1 predominantly to explain difficult grammar points or vocabulary and to maintain classroom discipline. This study suggests that while immersion in L2 remains important, teacher-led L1 use in moderation can make the classroom more effective by enhancing clarity and reducing confusion.

2.11.5 Student preferences and attitudes towards L1 use

Students' attitudes toward L1 use in the L2 classroom are also crucial in determining its extent. In some classrooms, learners strongly prefer to use their L1 as a means of making sense of new language rules and vocabulary. Yinager (2018) reported that students in English-medium classrooms in Ethiopia held positive attitudes toward using their local language, Amharic, to clarify academic content. These findings suggest that learners view L1 as a tool to enhance comprehension and reduce anxiety, especially in environments where they are not yet fully proficient in the L2.

Moreover, studies by Garza & Nava (2005) have shown that bilingual students tend to perform better in academic settings when allowed to switch between their L1 and L2, particularly when faced with challenging tasks. This suggests that students are more likely to engage in the classroom and learn effectively when they can use both languages inTarchangeably based on their needs.

The extent of L1 use in L2 classrooms varies depending on factors such as the learners' proficiency level, the classroom context, and the teaching methodology employed. While there is strong evidence supporting the benefits of minimizing L1 use to maximize L2 exposure, research also highlights the strategic role L1 can play in facilitating comprehension, reducing emotional stress, and promoting social interaction in language learning. Thus, a balanced approach that allows for judicious use of L1, especially when learners are struggling to understand difficult content or complex linguistic structures, may be the most effective way to support L2 learning. Teachers need to be flexible and responsive to students' needs, integrating L1 use when it contributes to a more supportive and productive language learning environment.

2.12 Comparative Studies and Global Perspectives on Code-Switching in Writing

Code-switching practices in educational contexts are deeply influenced by sociolinguistic environments, educational systems, and national language policies. While traditionally viewed as interference or a lack of proficiency, contemporary perspectives increasingly acknowledge code-switching as a complex, strategic, and context-sensitive linguistic behavior. Comparative studies across regions—particularly those distinguishing English as a Second Language (ESL) from English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts—reveal significant differences in the nature, frequency, and pedagogical reception of code-switching in writing. Additionally, sociogeographical variables such as rural versus urban schooling and the imposition of dominant language ideologies further shape students’ code-switching patterns and educational outcomes.

2.12.1 Case studies from different countries (ESL vs. EFL contexts)

The role and function of code-switching vary significantly between ESL and EFL contexts. In ESL environments, such as those in the United States, Canada, or the United Kingdom, English functions as a societal and instructional language, making it more readily accessible and

integrated into daily life. In these settings, students may use code-switching as a communicative bridge, particularly in early stages of language acquisition, and may even be encouraged to do so within bilingual education programs (Cummins, 2000; García & Kleyn, 2016).

For example, Canagarajah (2011) highlights how multilingual students in U.S. academic contexts use code-meshing—integrating features of multiple languages in writing—as a rhetorical strategy to convey complex identities and negotiate meaning. In such cases, code-switching is often seen as additive to students' linguistic repertoire and writing development.

In contrast, EFL contexts—such as Japan, Turkey, or most sub-Saharan African countries—position English primarily within the domain of formal education, limiting authentic exposure outside the classroom. In these environments, code-switching is often discouraged or penalized, perceived as a sign of linguistic weakness or lack of discipline (Muthusamy, 2009; Sert, 2005). A study by Lee (2010) on South Korean high schools found that students engaging in L1 code-switching during English writing tasks were often marked down for "language impurity," despite the clarity and coherence of their ideas.

The pedagogical framing of code-switching thus reflects broader cultural attitudes toward English and multilingualism, with ESL contexts generally exhibiting greater tolerance and integration of bilingual practices compared to more rigid EFL systems.

2.12.2 Comparative analysis of code-switching in rural vs. urban schools

Rural and urban educational settings also display significant variation in code-switching practices. In many multilingual nations, urban schools are typically more resourced, have access to more qualified English teachers, and often promote greater exposure to English through media and curriculum. As a result, code-switching in urban schools tends to be more deliberate and strategic, often used to scaffold complex academic content or express nuanced ideas in writing (Rubagumya, 2003; Probyn, 2009).

In contrast, students in rural schools—especially in under-resourced areas of South Asia or sub-Saharan Africa—may rely more heavily on their L1 for cognitive processing and written expression due to limited proficiency in English. Brock-Utne and Alidou (2006) observed that in

rural Tanzanian classrooms, students frequently interwove Kiswahili into English compositions, not only to compensate for vocabulary gaps but also to maintain coherence in argumentation. However, assessment policies that privilege monolingual English often penalize these practices, leading to lower writing scores despite strong cognitive engagement.

Moreover, teachers in rural schools often have limited training in bilingual pedagogy, and may lack strategies for constructively addressing code-switching in writing. This disparity reflects deeper issues of educational equity and the socio-political marginalization of rural learners.

2.12.3 Influence of dominant language policies in multilingual countries

National language policies significantly shape how code-switching is perceived and practiced in classrooms. In many post-colonial multilingual nations, dominant language ideologies favor former colonial languages—such as English or French—as the primary medium of instruction, often at the expense of indigenous languages (Phillipson, 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

South Africa provides a compelling case study. Despite constitutional recognition of eleven official languages, English remains the dominant language of assessment and higher education. Research by Probyn (2009) shows that students in both rural and urban schools frequently engage in code-switching between isiXhosa and English in writing tasks. However, national assessment standards typically demand English-only responses, thereby reinforcing linguistic hierarchies and disadvantaging bilingual learners.

In India, the three-language policy theoretically promotes multilingual competence, yet in practice, English-medium instruction is valorized, especially in urban schools. Mohanty (2006) highlights the “subtractive” nature of this model, where students' L1s are not leveraged for academic writing and are often stigmatized. Similarly, in Nigeria, despite widespread bilingualism or multilingualism, formal writing tasks in schools are expected to conform strictly to English norms, thereby marginalizing valuable code-switching strategies used by students to process and communicate complex ideas (Ajayi, 2006).

Conversely, countries like Canada and Luxembourg have developed additive bilingual education models where code-switching is seen as a resource rather than a deficiency. In such settings,

students are encouraged to draw upon their full linguistic repertoires in both spoken and written academic tasks (Swain, 2006; Hornberger & Link, 2012).

Global and comparative perspectives on code-switching in student writing reveal significant variation shaped by educational context, geography, and language policy. ESL environments tend to be more accepting of code-switching in writing, particularly when aligned with inclusive and additive bilingual pedagogies. In contrast, EFL contexts and rural schools often adhere to monolingual norms that limit the educational benefits of code-switching. Moreover, dominant language policies in multilingual countries frequently impose hierarchical language ideologies that further marginalize the use of students' L1s in writing. To foster more equitable writing instruction, educators and policymakers must reconceptualize code-switching not as a deficiency but as a legitimate, strategic, and pedagogically valuable aspect of bilingual competence.

2.13 Sociocultural and Contextual Influences on Code-Switching and Writing Performance

Language use in educational settings does not occur in isolation from broader sociocultural dynamics. For bilingual and multilingual students, the decision to code-switch—particularly in writing—is often shaped by deeply rooted social, cultural, and familial influences. Understanding the sociocultural dimensions of code-switching provides essential context for interpreting its effects on writing performance, especially in English language classrooms where language ideologies, identity construction, and community norms intersect.

2.13.1 Cultural identity and language use

Language is closely intertwined with cultural identity, and for bilingual learners, code-switching in writing often serves as a medium for expressing dual or hybrid identities. As Norton (2013) argues, language learning and use are acts of identity negotiation, where students align themselves with or distance themselves from certain linguistic and cultural affiliations. When students are allowed to incorporate their L1 (first language) alongside English in academic writing, they often report greater agency and ownership over their work (Canagarajah, 2011).

For example, García and Wei (2014) highlight translanguaging as a natural expression of bilingual identity, allowing students to fluidly draw on their full linguistic repertoire rather than artificially segmenting it into L1 and L2 categories. In many cases, writing that includes code-switching reflects deeper emotional or cultural resonance, particularly when students are engaging with personal narratives, community issues, or culturally situated knowledge.

The link between cultural identity and writing performance is especially salient among heritage language learners who navigate complex sociolinguistic terrains. Their code-switching may serve not only linguistic but symbolic functions—reclaiming cultural heritage, resisting assimilationist norms, or asserting bicultural perspectives (Hornberger & Link, 2012). Denying these students the opportunity to code-switch in writing can result in diminished expressive capacity and a disconnect between school language and lived experience.

2.13.2 Language attitudes and their impact on writing confidence

Language attitudes—whether held by teachers, peers, or society at large—strongly influence how students perceive their writing abilities. Negative attitudes toward code-switching, often rooted in monolingual ideologies, can stigmatize students' linguistic choices and undermine their confidence in academic writing (MacSwan, 2017). This stigma is especially prevalent in formal educational systems where "standard English" is prioritized, and deviations are viewed as errors rather than linguistic strategies.

Research by DeCosta and Norton (2017) illustrates how internalized language hierarchies affect learner identity and self-efficacy. Students who perceive their home language or dialect as inferior are less likely to engage confidently in academic tasks, including writing. Conversely, inclusive classroom practices that validate multilingualism—such as allowing code-switching in drafting stages or recognizing translanguaging as a legitimate mode of composition—can enhance student motivation and reduce writing anxiety.

Moreover, teacher beliefs about code-switching are critical. If instructors perceive code-switching as a sign of linguistic deficiency rather than cognitive resourcefulness, students may self-censor their writing or disengage altogether (Creese & Blackledge, 2010). On the other

hand, teachers who encourage multilingual expression often report improved writing fluency and richer content development among students.

2.13.3 Influence of community and family language practices

Community and family language practices form the bedrock of a student's linguistic habitus and significantly affect writing behavior in school. In multilingual families, where children grow up navigating multiple languages, code-switching is a natural and often unconscious part of daily communication (Wei, 2018). These practices shape not only the linguistic tools available to students but also their comfort and familiarity with switching between languages in written and oral contexts.

Sociolinguistic studies have found that when students' home language practices are acknowledged and incorporated into the curriculum, their academic performance improves, particularly in literacy-related tasks (Cummins, 2001; Moll et al., 1992). The concept of "funds of knowledge" (González et al., 2005) reinforces the idea that the linguistic and cultural capital students bring from home can be leveraged to support school-based learning. Writing assignments that allow code-switching can serve as bridges between home and school discourses, making academic writing more accessible and meaningful.

However, in communities where there is a strong societal preference for the dominant language—such as English—students may experience tension between their familial linguistic identity and institutional expectations. This tension can result in linguistic insecurity, reduced participation in writing tasks, or the overcorrection of L1 features in L2 writing. Conversely, supportive family attitudes toward bilingualism and active parental involvement in literacy activities in both languages correlate positively with writing confidence and achievement (Kenner, 2004).

The sociocultural context in which code-switching occurs plays a pivotal role in shaping students' writing development. Cultural identity, language ideologies, and home language environments all converge to influence students' willingness and ability to use multiple languages in writing. Educational systems that recognize and accommodate these sociocultural factors—by legitimizing code-switching and honoring multilingual identities—are better

positioned to support inclusive, effective writing instruction. Rather than viewing code-switching as a barrier, educators should embrace it as a reflection of students' lived experiences and linguistic dexterity.

2.14 Student and Teacher Perspectives on Code-Switching in the English Classroom

Understanding the effects of code-switching on students' writing performance necessitates close attention to the lived experiences of both learners and educators. Qualitative studies have revealed that attitudes toward code-switching, teaching practices, and classroom discourse patterns profoundly shape its use and impact. This section explores three major areas: (1) student experiences and perceptions of code-switching, (2) teacher strategies regarding its implementation or restriction, and (3) patterns of classroom interaction involving code-switching.

2.14.1 Qualitative insights into student experiences with code-switching

Students' experiences with code-switching are deeply contextual and shaped by their linguistic backgrounds, academic goals, and identity positions. Numerous qualitative studies suggest that learners often use code-switching strategically to navigate complex cognitive tasks, clarify understanding, and manage emotional expression in their writing and speech (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García & Kleyn, 2016). For example, students may switch to their L1 during brainstorming, drafting, or when expressing culturally specific ideas for which they feel their L2 lacks sufficient nuance.

Some students report that the ability to code-switch helps maintain the flow of writing, particularly when encountering lexical gaps or syntactic uncertainty in English. This phenomenon is not simply a compensatory mechanism but also reflects cognitive flexibility and metalinguistic awareness (Velasco & García, 2014). Moreover, code-switching often allows students to more fully represent their cultural identities and worldviews, which enhances engagement and relevance in academic tasks (Canagarajah, 2011).

However, not all students view code-switching positively. Those from educational environments that stigmatize the use of non-standard English or native languages may internalize the idea that

code-switching is academically inferior. As a result, they may avoid it even when it could serve a communicative or cognitive purpose (MacSwan, 2017). Such internalized language hierarchies can negatively affect writing confidence and linguistic creativity.

2.14.2 Teacher strategies for integrating or discouraging code-switching

Teachers play a critical role in shaping students' attitudes and behaviors toward code-switching. Some educators view code-switching as a legitimate pedagogical tool and encourage its use to facilitate learning, build rapport, and foster deeper comprehension—especially in multilingual or EFL contexts (Lin, 2013). These teachers may allow students to use their L1 in early writing stages or group discussions and then scaffold translation into academic English.

In contrast, others see code-switching as a barrier to full English immersion and may discourage or outright prohibit its use in academic writing or classroom communication. This approach, while often driven by curriculum standards or testing requirements, can alienate students who rely on their native languages for meaning-making and expression (Sert, 2005). The strict enforcement of English-only policies has been shown to suppress participation, especially among lower-proficiency learners (Probyn, 2009).

Nevertheless, many educators adopt a more nuanced stance. Some integrate translanguaging pedagogies that acknowledge the sociocultural realities of bilingual learners, promoting code-switching as a scaffold rather than a crutch (García & Wei, 2014). For example, translanguaging moments are planned into classroom routines, such as peer feedback, brainstorming, or writing reflections, to enable students to draw from their full linguistic repertoire before converting ideas into formal English.

2.14.3 Classroom interaction patterns involving code-switching

Classroom interaction is a rich site for observing how code-switching functions in real time between students and teachers. Research has shown that code-switching in classroom discourse often occurs for specific communicative functions: explaining difficult concepts, managing classroom behavior, translating key terms, or expressing empathy (Sert, 2005; Lin, 2013). In

writing instruction specifically, teachers may switch languages to provide grammar explanations or scaffold metalinguistic awareness.

Student-student interactions frequently involve spontaneous code-switching, particularly in collaborative writing tasks. This allows students to co-construct meaning and negotiate language forms more fluidly than in teacher-fronted exchanges. These interactions support academic language development by creating a bridge between everyday conversational discourse and more formal writing registers (Hornberger & Link, 2012).

Yet, the classroom's sociolinguistic norms often dictate whether such practices are sustained or suppressed. In environments where code-switching is normalized, students are more likely to experiment linguistically and produce richer writing content. Conversely, in highly monolingual environments, such interactions may be curtailed, reducing opportunities for authentic language use and collaborative learning.

Student and teacher perspectives on code-switching offer vital insight into how it functions as both a learning strategy and a cultural practice. When supported, code-switching in writing can empower students, enhance comprehension, and foster creative expression. However, when discouraged, it may hinder engagement and reinforce linguistic inequality. Educators who understand and strategically incorporate code-switching into classroom interactions and writing instruction can more effectively support the linguistic and academic development of multilingual learners.

2.15 Gaps in the Literature on Code-Switching and Writing Performance

Despite the growing body of research exploring code-switching in multilingual educational contexts, several significant gaps persist that limit a comprehensive understanding of its impact on students' writing development. These gaps pertain to the underrepresentation of certain student populations, the scarcity of longitudinal research designs, and the limited application of diverse methodological approaches such as mixed-methods and corpus-based studies.

2.15.1 Under-researched student groups

A notable gap in the existing literature is the relative neglect of specific student demographics, particularly younger learners and minority language speakers. Much of the current research focuses on secondary or tertiary level students who already possess a certain degree of L2 proficiency and cognitive maturity (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García & Wei, 2014). In contrast, primary or early childhood learners, who are in critical stages of both first and second language development, have received comparatively less attention. Understanding how code-switching functions during these early formative years could yield valuable insights into scaffolding writing skills and fostering bilingual literacy from a young age (Kenner, 2004).

Similarly, minority language speakers—often marginalized within national educational systems—are underrepresented in empirical studies. These learners may possess unique bilingual repertoires shaped by complex sociopolitical and cultural realities that influence their code-switching behavior and writing performance (MacSwan, 2017). The paucity of research on this group hinders the development of inclusive pedagogies tailored to their specific linguistic needs and identities.

2.15.2 Lack of longitudinal studies

Another critical gap lies in the scarcity of longitudinal studies investigating the effects of code-switching on writing development over time. Most existing research relies on cross-sectional designs or snapshot case studies, which, while informative, cannot capture the dynamic, evolving nature of bilingual writing acquisition (Velasco & García, 2014). Longitudinal research is essential to understand whether code-switching facilitates sustained growth in language proficiency, writing complexity, and academic achievement, or if its effects are limited to short-term scaffolding.

Long-term studies would also help elucidate how learners' attitudes, code-switching frequency, and writing strategies change across different educational stages and language contexts. Without such data, educators and policymakers lack robust evidence to inform best practices regarding the integration or restriction of code-switching in curricula.

2.15.3 Need for more mixed-methods and corpus-based approaches

Methodologically, the literature reveals a predominance of qualitative or small-scale quantitative studies, with relatively few employing mixed-methods or corpus-based approaches. While qualitative research offers rich, contextualized insights into individual and classroom experiences, and quantitative studies provide measurable outcomes, combining these approaches can yield a more holistic understanding of code-switching's multifaceted impact (Canagarajah, 2011).

Corpus-based studies, in particular, hold great promise for systematically analyzing large samples of written texts produced by bilingual learners. Such analyses can uncover patterns in grammar, vocabulary, cohesion, and syntactic complexity related to code-switching that might be overlooked in smaller datasets (Velasco & García, 2014). Moreover, corpora enable longitudinal tracking of linguistic changes and the identification of recurrent translanguaging phenomena in student writing.

The integration of mixed methods—combining classroom observations, interviews, and corpus analysis—would allow researchers to triangulate data sources, thus enhancing the validity and applicability of findings. However, such comprehensive studies remain limited in the current body of work.

Addressing these gaps is essential for advancing the field's understanding of code-switching's role in writing development. Future research should prioritize inclusive sampling of diverse student populations, invest in longitudinal designs to trace developmental trajectories, and incorporate mixed-methods and corpus linguistics to deepen empirical rigor. Filling these gaps will provide more nuanced, evidence-based guidance for educators seeking to optimize writing instruction in multilingual classrooms.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methodology employed to address the study's objectives and to answer the research questions. It describes the overall research design and explains the rationale for selecting specific methods, and procedures. Additionally, it details the processes used for data collection, sampling, and data analysis.

3.1 Study Design

This study investigated the impact of classroom code-switching on students' writing performance. A quasi-experimental research design, grounded in the pragmatic paradigm, was employed to systematically examine how different instructional approaches influence students' writing outcomes. The pragmatic stance also enabled the inclusion of qualitative insights, allowing teachers' perceptions of students' performance during CS-supported instruction to be explored.

The independent variable in this study was the mode of classroom instruction, operationalized into two distinct conditions: (1) English-Only Instruction, where English served as the sole medium of instruction, and (2) Classroom CS, wherein the instructional process incorporated both English and students' first language in a pedagogically strategic manner. The dependent variable was students' writing performance, which was assessed through standardized writing tasks, evaluated using predetermined rubrics to ensure consistency and objectivity in scoring.

Given that the study primarily necessitated numerical data for statistical analysis, it was predominantly quantitative in nature. However, to provide a more nuanced understanding of the findings, qualitative data—such as teachers' perceptions of instructional methods and their self-reported experiences with code-switching—were integrated as a supplementary component. This mixed-methods approach would enhance the interpretative depth of the study by triangulating statistical findings with qualitative insights.

To ensure the rigor and validity of the research, a pre-test and post-test design was employed, allowing for an objective measurement of students' writing performance before and after exposure to the instructional conditions. Additionally, inferential statistical techniques, such as

independent samples t-tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA), were utilized to determine whether the observed differences in writing performance between groups were statistically significant.

By adopting this research design, the study aimed to contribute to the broader discourse on bilingual education and language pedagogy, offering empirical insights into the potential benefits and limitations of classroom CS in writing instruction.

3.2 Study Setting and Context

This study was conducted in Dawro Zone, located in the South West Ethiopian Region (SWER), Ethiopia. Dawro Zone is situated 496 km from Addis Ababa**,** 280 km from Hawassa, and 148 km from Jimma. Geographically, it shares borders with the Oromia Region to the north**,** Kembata Tembaro Zone to the northeast**,** Wolaita Zone to the east**,** Gofa Zone to the south, and Konta Zone to the west. Except for the Konta Zone, all neighboring zones are separated from Dawro by the Omo River, which encircles the zone on nearly all sides. Administratively, Dawro Zone comprises ten weredas and two town administrations.

The Dawro people speak Dawro Doona (Dawro language), which serves as the primary means of communication within the community. Dawro Doona is used as the medium of instruction from grades one to four and is also taught as a subject from grades one to ten. Additionally, it serves as the medium of instruction in teachers' training institutions for first-cycle teachers. At the tertiary level, Wolaita Sodo University, Dawro Tarcha Campus, offers a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in Dawro Doona (Dubbaala, 1998; FRDE, 2020).

The study was conducted at Dawro Tarcha Campus of Wolaita Sodo University, where the Dawro Doona Department is one of several academic units. Students enrolled in this department specialize in Dawro Doona after successfully completing their freshman-year coursework, following the nationally harmonized curriculum for Ethiopian higher education. As part of their academic program, students are required to take a range of English language courses designed to develop their linguistic competence and academic writing skills. These courses include Communicative English Language Skills I (FLEn-1011) and Communicative English Language Skills II (FLEn-1012)**,** which focus on foundational language skills, as well as Sophomore

English (EnLa 2043), Spoken English I (EnLa 1026)**,** and Spoken English II (EnLa 1021) which emphasize oral proficiency and advanced literacy. Additionally, students undertake Advanced Composition in English (EnLa 2071)**,** a course dedicated to enhancing their academic writing and critical thinking skills. This structured curriculum ensures that students acquire both theoretical knowledge and practical language skills, equipping them with the linguistic proficiency necessary for academic and professional success.

Since the primary aim of this study was to investigate the impact of classroom code-switching on students' writing performance, the research focused on the course titled *Advanced Composition in English (EnLa 2071),* which was being offered during the data collection period. This particular course was selected due to its emphasis on developing advanced academic writing skills, making it an appropriate context for examining the effects of language practices such as code-switching. Accordingly, students enrolled in EnLa 2071 were purposively selected as research participants. This purposive sampling strategy was employed to ensure the inclusion of individuals who were actively engaged in writing-intensive instruction and thus most likely to be influenced by the classroom code-switching practices under investigation.

The selection of Dawro Zone as the research site was based on considerations of accessibility and familiarity. The researcher, being a member of the Dawro community and fluent in the language, possessed an in-depth understanding of the local sociolinguistic and cultural context. This facilitated smoother interaction with participants and minimized bureaucratic challenges during the data collection process.

3.3 Participants and Selection Techniques

The participants of this study comprised Dawro Doona major students from Wolaita Sodo University, Dawro Tarcha Campus, as well as university instructors responsible for teaching Writing Skills courses. The selection process for both participant groups was carried out systematically to ensure the reliability and validity of the study.

3.3.1 Selection of participant teachers

To facilitate the selection of an appropriate instructor for the study, key administrative figures—including the campus dean, the academic affairs dean, the head of the Dawro Doona Department, and the head of the English Language and Literature Department—were initially consulted. The head of the Dawro Doona Department provided critical information regarding the structure of courses, student distribution, and enrollment statistics. Meanwhile, the head of the English Language and Literature Department was approached since this department was responsible for delivering English language courses to students from various disciplines on campus.

Within the English Language and Literature Department, there were four English language instructors—three male and one female. Among them, three held a Master's degree (MA) in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), while one had an MA in Linguistics. Notably, all four instructors were native speakers of Dawro Doona, which was identified as a key advantage in minimizing potential extraneous variables associated with linguistic differences between instructors.

For the purposes of this study, a male instructor with an MA in TEFL and twelve years of teaching experience was assigned by the department. The selection of an instructor who could uniformly manage both the experimental and control groups—differing only in instructional approach—was deemed essential in reducing potential teacher-related biases that might influence student performance.

Following the participant selection process, a series of in-depth consultations were conducted with the course instructor to align the teaching methodologies and assessment strategies with the objectives of the study. These discussions addressed several critical elements, including the overall purpose of the study, the selection of lesson topics, the instructional approaches to be employed, the assessment techniques to be used, and the specific nature and scope of the code-switching practices to be implemented. Ultimately, the instructor agreed to adhere strictly to the planned use of CS and to maintain consistency in all instructional variables across both study groups, with the sole exception being the type of instructional language used. This ensured that

any observed differences in student performance could be attributed primarily to the variation in code-switching, rather than to other pedagogical factors.

3.3.2 Selection of participant students

The primary objective of this study was to examine the effects of classroom code-switching on students' writing performance. To ensure the reliability and validity of the findings, it was essential to identify a class in which all students shared the same first language. This criterion was necessary to minimize potential linguistic variability and to avoid sociolinguistic or political complications that could arise from a linguistically diverse classroom. By controlling for L1, the study aimed to isolate the impact of code-switching more accurately, ensuring that any observed effects could be attributed to the instructional language strategy rather than to differences in students' language backgrounds.

Accordingly, the study targeted students who were fluent speakers of the Dawro language and had chosen to study it as their major. The participants were thirty-three Dawro Doona major students enrolled in the Advanced Composition in English (EnLa 2071) course at Wolaita Sodo University, Dawro Tarcha Campus. This selection ensured both linguistic homogeneity and contextual relevance, allowing for a focused investigation into the effects of classroom code-switching on writing performance. However, it is important to acknowledge that the relatively small sample size (n = 33) may limit the statistical power of the study. As a result, while the design allows for the detection of large effects, it may not be sufficiently sensitive to detect small to moderate differences between instructional conditions. Consequently, non-significant findings should be interpreted cautiously, as they may reflect the absence of statistically detectable effects under the given conditions rather than the absence of any effect altogether.

A total of thirty-three students, all of whom had successfully completed their freshman and second-year coursework, were eligible to participate in the study. Initially, these students had been placed into a single section for their second-year courses, which made it theoretically feasible to conduct the experiment within one intact class. While using the full cohort as a single experimental group would have been methodologically ideal, several practical constraints necessitated an alternative approach.

First, the students expressed reluctance to undergo repeated assessments, which were essential for monitoring progress and evaluating outcomes. Second, the course instructor was hesitant to assume the additional workload associated with frequent grading and feedback. Third, implementing both instructional approaches—code-switching and non-code-switching—within the same group would have required a significantly extended instructional period, surpassing the time allocated for the course and potentially disrupting the academic calendar.

In light of these challenges, the class was divided into two groups. This adjustment allowed the research to proceed in a manner that was both logistically feasible and aligned with the study's core objectives, while minimizing disruptions to the normal teaching and learning process.

To facilitate the grouping process, consultations were held with the campus dean, academic affairs dean, department heads, and the course instructor. Through mutual agreement, it was decided to divide the students into two separate sections specifically for the purposes of this study. This division enabled the implementation of a quasi-experimental design, wherein one group served as the experimental group—receiving instruction that incorporated code-switching—while the other functioned as the control group, receiving instruction exclusively in English.

This structure allowed for a direct and systematic comparison between the two groups, thereby facilitating a more accurate assessment of the influence of code-switching on students' writing performance. Moreover, by maintaining consistent instructional content, scheduling, and the same instructor across both groups, the study was able to isolate the instructional language strategy as the primary variable of interest. This methodological approach was designed to enhance the internal validity of the research and support more robust and reliable conclusions regarding the relationship between classroom code-switching and students' writing outcomes.

To ensure an equitable distribution of students between the experimental and control groups, a pre-test was administered, and students were systematically assigned to the two sections based on their pre-test performance. This stratified assignment ensured that both groups had a comparable level of writing proficiency prior to the intervention, thereby strengthening the internal validity of the study and supporting more reliable comparisons of post-test outcomes.

3.4 Data Collection Tools

To achieve the objectives of this study, a pre-test, a post-test, and interviews were employed as data collection instruments.

3.4.1 The pre-test

To establish a reliable baseline for measuring the effects of classroom code-switching on students' writing performance, a pre-test was administered prior to the instructional intervention. This pre-test served a dual purpose. First, it functioned as a diagnostic tool to assess students' initial writing proficiency, providing a comprehensive understanding of their strengths and areas for improvement. Second, it was used as a placement instrument to ensure an equitable and methodologically sound distribution of participants into the experimental and control groups. By evaluating students' writing abilities at the outset, the study sought to control for any pre-existing differences between the two groups, thereby enhancing the internal validity of the research and allowing for a more accurate interpretation of the instructional intervention's effects.

The pre-test was carefully designed to evaluate a wide range of writing-related competencies, encompassing both discrete language skills and integrative writing tasks. It consisted of seven major components, each targeting specific dimensions of academic writing proficiency. The first section required students to rearrange scrambled words to form syntactically and semantically correct sentences. This task, comprising three items, was intended to assess students' grasp of English sentence structure and their ability to construct grammatically sound statements.

The second section focused on textual cohesion. Here, students completed five items requiring the selection of appropriate cohesive devices—such as conjunctions, transitional phrases, and referential expressions—to logically link ideas within and across sentences. This component aimed to measure students' understanding of how coherence is maintained in written discourse. In the third section, students were asked to identify the topic sentence in two given paragraphs. This task assessed their ability to recognize main ideas and structural features within paragraph-level organization.

In the fourth section, students were provided with a list of supporting details and asked to generate an appropriate topic sentence for each set. With two items in total, this task evaluated students' ability to synthesize information and formulate central ideas, a key skill in academic writing. The fifth component of the test involved rearranging five jumbled sentences into a coherent paragraph. This activity assessed students' understanding of logical sequencing and their capacity to construct unified paragraphs.

Building upon the paragraph-level organization, the sixth section of the test asked students to rearrange four scrambled paragraphs to form a well-structured essay. This task was designed to assess students' ability to organize extended discourse, demonstrating control over essay-level coherence and thematic progression. Finally, the seventh component required students to compose a complete essay on a given topic. This integrative task measured students' overall writing competence, including grammar, vocabulary, coherence, organization, content relevance, and the ability to communicate ideas effectively in written form.

Overall, the design of the pre-test reflected a balanced integration of lower-order and higher-order writing skills. It provided a multifaceted profile of each student's writing ability, which not only facilitated equitable group assignment but also served as a critical point of comparison for evaluating the effectiveness of the code-switching intervention. The comprehensive nature of the pre-test thus contributed significantly to the methodological rigor of the study, supporting reliable and valid conclusions regarding the impact of instructional language strategies on students' writing performance.

3.4.2 The post-test

In contrast to the pre-test, which served as a diagnostic and placement tool, the post-test was administered as an achievement test designed to evaluate students' learning outcomes following the instructional intervention. Its primary purpose was to measure the extent to which students had developed their writing proficiency as a result of the instructional approaches implemented in the experimental and control groups. The post-test was administered after the completion of the instructional period and was carefully aligned with the pre-test in both structure and content to enable a meaningful comparison of students' progress.

The post-test assessed a range of writing skills across both micro- and macro-level language competencies. It was structured into seven components, mirroring those of the pre-test to ensure consistency and comparability. The first component consisted of six items requiring students to rearrange scrambled words to form grammatically correct and meaningful sentences. This task evaluated students' control of syntax and sentence structure, reflecting improvements in grammatical accuracy and sentence formation.

The second component included five items that tested students' ability to select appropriate cohesive devices to link ideas within and between sentences. This section aimed to measure students' understanding and application of cohesion, a fundamental aspect of coherent writing. In the third section, students were presented with two paragraphs and asked to identify the topic sentence in each. This task assessed their ability to discern central ideas and understand paragraph organization.

In the fourth section, students were provided with sets of supporting details and were asked to construct appropriate topic sentences. This task, which included two items, evaluated students' skills in summarizing and synthesizing information to produce thematically relevant and logically structured topic statements. The fifth component required students to rearrange five jumbled sentences to form a coherent paragraph, measuring their ability to establish logical flow and unity within a paragraph.

The sixth section involved rearranging five disordered paragraphs to create a well-structured essay. This task assessed students' understanding of essay organization, including the logical progression of ideas, paragraph transitions, and overall coherence. Finally, the seventh and most comprehensive section required students to compose a full essay on a given topic. This integrative task measured a wide range of writing skills, including content development, organization, grammar, vocabulary, coherence, and the ability to express ideas effectively in extended written discourse.

By employing a structure parallel to that of the pre-test, the post-test enabled a systematic analysis of students' writing development attributable to the instructional intervention. This design ensured that any changes in performance could be reliably interpreted as outcomes of the

experimental conditions, thereby reinforcing the internal validity of the study. Moreover, the use of a well-aligned pre- and post-test framework allowed for the quantitative and qualitative evaluation of gains in writing proficiency, facilitating a robust assessment of the pedagogical effectiveness of code-switching in the academic writing classroom.

3.4.3 Interview

In addition to the quantitative measures employed in this study, a semi-structured interview was conducted with two purposively selected English language instructors to gain qualitative insights into the use of students' first language, Dawro Doona, in English language instruction. The primary objective of the interview was to explore the prevalence, rationale, and pedagogical implications of code-switching practices within the classroom context. Specifically, the interview sought to understand the instructors' perspectives on the role of L1 use in facilitating students' English language learning, with a particular focus on writing skills.

The interview questions were designed to elicit detailed responses on several key areas. First, instructors were asked whether they engaged in code-switching between English and Dawro Doona during instruction. If they did, follow-up questions explored their reasons for doing so—such as to clarify difficult concepts, support comprehension, reduce anxiety, or engage students more effectively. If they reported avoiding code-switching, the interview probed the rationale behind this choice, including potential concerns about dependency on L1 or the belief that exclusive use of English promotes immersion and proficiency.

Further, the interview addressed instructors' observations regarding student comfort levels and engagement during lessons conducted with code-switching versus English-only instruction. Instructors were asked to reflect on which approach—CS or EO—they perceived to be more effective in enhancing students' academic performance and language achievement. A final set of questions focused specifically on writing skills, inviting instructors to share their views on the level at which code-switching is most beneficial for learners—whether at the sentence, paragraph, or essay level.

The semi-structured format allowed for both consistency in questioning and flexibility in exploring relevant themes that emerged during the interviews. The responses obtained provided

valuable contextual data to complement the quantitative findings, enriching the overall analysis of how code-switching functions as a pedagogical tool in the teaching of academic writing.

Overall, the combination of the pre-test, post-test, and interview allowed for a comprehensive investigation into the effectiveness of classroom code-switching. The pre-test served to diagnose students' initial writing proficiency, the post-test measured learning outcomes following instructional intervention, and the interview provided qualitative insights into teachers' perspectives on L1 use in English language teaching.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

To ensure consistency, validity, and reliability throughout the research process, data collection was carried out using a systematic and structured sequence aligned with the study's experimental design. The study employed a pre-test post-test control group design, a widely recognized model for experimental research, which allowed for the examination of causal relationships between the instructional intervention (code-switching) and students' writing performance.

The process began with the administration of a pre-test to all participating students. This test was designed to establish baseline writing proficiency levels and facilitate the equitable and randomized assignment of participants into either the experimental or control group. The pre-test compositions were assessed using a holistic scoring rubric, and students' scores were systematically recorded in Microsoft Excel. To ensure a balanced distribution of writing abilities across both groups, a rank-ordering method was used: students with even-numbered ranks were placed in one group, while those with odd-numbered ranks were assigned to the other. This method minimized initial proficiency discrepancies and strengthened the internal validity of the study by ensuring comparable group characteristics prior to the intervention.

Following the pre-test, semi-structured interviews were conducted with two purposively selected English language instructors. The objective of these interviews was to explore the prevalence and pedagogical role of L1 (Dawro Doona) use in English language classrooms. Specifically, the interviews aimed to gather instructors' perspectives on the rationale for code-switching, their perceptions of its impact on students' language development, and the challenges associated with its implementation. Interview questions explored whether and why instructors used code-

switching, student responses to instruction in L1 versus English-only, and their views on which instructional mode—code-switching or English-only—contributed more effectively to students' writing development. Additionally, instructors were asked to comment on the level of writing (sentence, paragraph, or essay) at which they believed students benefit most from code-switching. The qualitative data collected provided contextual insights that complemented the quantitative findings.

The instructional treatment phase followed the initial assessments. During this phase, the experimental group received instruction that explicitly incorporated code-switching between English and Dawro Doona, while the control group was taught using an English-Only approach. Both groups were exposed to identical instructional content, delivered over the same period and by the same instructor. This consistency in content delivery and instructional duration helped ensure that the only differing variable between the two groups was the language of instruction, thereby isolating the effect of code-switching.

At the end of the intervention period, a post-test was administered to assess the impact of the instructional approaches on students' writing performance. Unlike the holistic scoring method used in the pre-test, the post-test compositions were evaluated using an analytic scoring rubric, which allowed for a more detailed assessment across several dimensions of writing, including organization, coherence, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. This change in scoring method was intentional, as it provided a more nuanced understanding of students' development in specific writing sub-skills.

Finally, both quantitative and qualitative data were systematically analyzed. Pre-test and post-test scores were subjected to statistical analysis to determine whether there were significant differences in performance between the two groups. The qualitative data obtained from the instructor interviews were analyzed thematically to identify common patterns, attitudes, and instructional beliefs related to the use of students' L1 in English language teaching. This mixed-methods approach allowed for triangulation of findings, thereby enhancing the depth and credibility of the study's conclusions.

Overall, the structured and multi-phased data collection process ensured methodological rigor and contributed to the reliability and validity of the research findings. By combining quantitative measures with qualitative insights, the study was able to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of classroom code-switching in improving students' academic writing skills.

3.6 Experimental Conditions and Implementation Fidelity Monitoring

This study adopted a pre-test–post-test control group design to investigate the effect of instructional language (code-switching versus English-only instruction) on students' English writing performance. A pre-test was administered prior to the intervention to establish baseline comparability between participants. Student grouping was conducted collaboratively with campus management bodies, department heads, and the course instructor to ensure procedural fairness and administrative accuracy. Group allocation was subsequently finalized through a lottery method, whereby one group was randomly assigned as the experimental group and the other as the control group.

To reduce instructor-related variability and ensure instructional consistency across conditions, a single bilingual instructor proficient in both Dawro Doona and English was assigned to teach both groups. This decision was made to minimize potential teacher effects and to ensure that any observed differences in student performance could be more confidently attributed to the instructional approach rather than differences in teaching style or competence.

The intervention was implemented over a full academic semester. In the experimental group, instruction followed a structured code-switching approach, allowing for the strategic use of Dawro Doona alongside English for purposes such as explaining complex concepts, clarifying instructions, and supporting idea generation, while maintaining English as the dominant instructional language. In contrast, the control group received instruction exclusively in English, with no use of the students' first language permitted. Both groups participated in parallel instructional activities, including sentence-level exercises, paragraph development tasks, and essay writing, designed to progressively develop students' writing competence. At the end of the intervention, a post-test was administered under standardized conditions, and students' writing

performance was assessed using a structured analytic rubric covering organization, coherence, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary, and mechanics.

To safeguard the internal validity of the experimental design, systematic implementation fidelity monitoring was conducted throughout the instructional period. In this study, implementation fidelity refers to the extent to which instructional procedures in both the code-switching and English-only conditions were delivered as intended in the research design.

A detailed instructional protocol was developed to guide implementation in both conditions. The protocol clearly specified lesson objectives, instructional sequencing, and language-use expectations. In the English-only group, strict adherence to English-medium instruction was required, with no use of Dawro Doona permitted. In the code-switching group, the protocol allowed for the strategic and pedagogically purposeful use of Dawro Doona alongside English, particularly for clarifying abstract concepts, scaffolding comprehension, and facilitating writing processes, while maintaining English as the primary medium of instruction.

Fidelity was monitored using multiple complementary procedures. First, structured classroom observations were conducted using a checklist designed to assess adherence to the instructional protocol, with particular attention to language use, teacher–student interaction patterns, and lesson delivery processes. Second, selected classroom sessions were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. These transcripts provided detailed records of classroom discourse, enabling verification of whether English-only instruction was maintained in the control group and how code-switching was enacted in the experimental group. Relevant excerpts from these transcripts are presented in the appendices as supporting evidence of implementation practices.

In addition, the instructor maintained brief reflective logs after selected lessons to document any deviations from the planned instructional procedures and to provide contextual explanations where necessary. These reflective notes offered additional insight into classroom dynamics and helped identify situational factors influencing instructional delivery.

The data obtained from observations, transcripts, and reflective logs were triangulated to enhance the credibility and dependability of the fidelity monitoring process. Overall, the evidence indicated a high level of adherence to the prescribed instructional conditions in both groups, with

only minor, context-specific deviations that did not compromise the integrity of the treatment conditions.

The combination of random assignment, controlled instructor allocation, structured instructional protocols, and systematic fidelity monitoring ensured that the experimental conditions were implemented with a high degree of consistency. This strengthens the internal validity of the study and supports the interpretation that observed differences—or lack thereof—in writing performance can be attributed with greater confidence to the instructional language treatment.

3.7 Materials

This section outlines the instructional materials and assessment rubrics used in the study. The instructional content was drawn from Ethiopia's nationally harmonized curriculum to ensure consistency with university-level standards. Both the experimental and control groups followed the same course content, with the only difference being the language of instruction. In addition, standardized rubrics were developed to evaluate students' writing at the sentence, paragraph, and essay levels. These tools ensured objective, consistent, and reliable assessment of writing performance across both groups.

3.7.1 Instructional materials

As this study was conducted at the university level, the instructional materials were developed in alignment with Ethiopia's nationally harmonized curriculum. This alignment ensured that all course content adhered to standardized learning objectives and met the academic expectations outlined for higher education institutions. The *Advanced Composition in English* course syllabus served as the central instructional framework, providing a structured and comprehensive guide for content delivery. This framework enabled the instructor to maintain consistency with the anticipated course outcomes while ensuring both pedagogical depth and academic rigor.

The official course syllabus encompassed a broad range of content areas designed to enhance students' academic writing proficiency. It began with foundational topics such as essential language skills, common challenges in paragraph writing, and the correct application of punctuation and capitalization. Subsequent units focused on paragraph development, including

the structure and function of topic sentences, supporting details, and concluding statements. The syllabus introduced various paragraph types—descriptive, narrative, argumentative, and expository—each aimed at developing students' ability to convey ideas clearly and effectively. In addition, it addressed the qualities of a well-developed paragraph, emphasizing unity, coherence, completeness, and logical organization.

Students were also introduced to diverse organizational patterns for paragraph writing, including chronological order, spatial order, order of importance, order of familiarity, and comparison and contrast. Building upon this foundation, the course transitioned to essay writing, covering the processes of topic selection, planning, and structuring essays with coherent thesis statements, well-developed body paragraphs, and appropriate conclusions. Instruction extended to different types of essays—descriptive, narrative, expository, and argumentative—providing students with a comprehensive foundation in academic composition. Finally, the syllabus covered methods for integrating external sources through paraphrasing, direct quotation, and summarizing, thereby reinforcing students' ability to construct well-supported academic texts.

To ensure consistency in instructional delivery and uphold the internal validity of the experimental research design, a detailed consultation was held with the course instructor prior to implementation. This discussion focused on standardizing the instructional flow across both the experimental and control groups. It was agreed that all students would receive identical instructional content, follow the same lesson sequence, and engage in the same classroom activities. The only variable introduced was the medium of instruction: the experimental group received instruction through a code-switching approach, while the control group was taught exclusively in English.

In addition to the officially prescribed syllabus, supplementary instructional materials were collaboratively developed by the researcher and the course instructor. These included customized notes, targeted practice exercises, and structured writing activities designed to reinforce course objectives and support incremental skill development. Particular emphasis was placed on key areas such as sentence construction, paragraph organization, and essay composition. All supplementary materials were purposefully aligned with the course syllabus to ensure pedagogical coherence and uniformity in instructional delivery across both study groups.

The integration of the nationally harmonized curriculum with researcher-developed resources ensured a comprehensive and well-balanced instructional approach. This careful preparation helped to establish a controlled and consistent learning environment in which the instructional language—code-switching versus English-only—served as the sole independent variable. As a result, the design facilitated a valid and systematic assessment of the impact of code-switching on students' writing performance.

3.7.2 Rubrics

To ensure objective, consistent, and comprehensive evaluation of students' writing performance, a standardized grading rubric was developed by the researcher based on established principles of academic writing. The rubric was designed to assess writing at three levels—sentence, paragraph, and essay—allowing for a holistic appraisal of students' writing abilities while also offering targeted feedback on specific skill areas. Each rubric employed a four-point scale, ranging from 4 (no errors) to 1 (frequent errors), thereby enabling the evaluators to gauge the degree of accuracy and proficiency in a structured and quantifiable manner.

At the sentence level, the rubric focused on two main elements: language accuracy and structural integrity. The language component assessed spelling, tense consistency, punctuation, grammatical correctness, subject-verb agreement, and antecedent-pronoun clarity. The structural component evaluated sentence completeness, logical sequencing, correct word order, and the appropriate use of coordinating or subordinating conjunctions in compound and complex sentence constructions.

At the paragraph level, the rubric expanded to encompass structural coherence, idea development, explicitness, and language use. Structural criteria included the presence of a clear introduction, effective conclusion, sentence segmentation, and logical arrangement of ideas. Idea development was measured through the adequacy of supporting points, use of credible evidence, and integration of external ideas. The rubric also assessed explicitness by examining whether key concepts and goals were clearly communicated and whether transitions effectively linked ideas. Linguistic accuracy was evaluated through grammar, spelling, tense usage, and punctuation.

The essay-level rubric followed a similar structure but accounted for the broader scope of composition. It assessed the clarity and relevance of the introduction and conclusion, logical paragraph segmentation, and smooth transitions between sections. Idea development criteria included the sufficiency of arguments supporting the thesis statement, the credibility and relevance of evidence, and proper citation of external sources. Explicitness and cohesion were judged by the clarity of key concepts, articulation of textual goals, and effective use of linking devices. Language use was evaluated in terms of grammatical accuracy, spelling, punctuation, and tense consistency.

By employing this detailed and structured rubric across both pre-test and post-test evaluations, the study ensured methodological consistency and minimized potential evaluators bias. The uniform application of the rubric across both the experimental and control groups contributed to the internal validity of the study and enhanced the reliability of the results. This approach enabled a fair and systematic comparison of writing performance outcomes, allowing for clearer attribution of any observed differences to the instructional method—namely, code-switching versus English-only instruction.

3.7.3 Theoretical Justification for Rubric Dimensions

The analytic rubric employed in this study is grounded in established theoretical models of writing competence, which conceptualize writing as a multidimensional construct comprising distinct yet interrelated components. Specifically, the rubric draws on the cognitive process model of writing developed by Linda Flower and John Hayes (1981) and subsequently refined by Hayes (1996), alongside influential contributions to second language writing by Hyland (2003, 2019). Together, these frameworks provide a robust theoretical basis for differentiating the four dimensions assessed in this study: grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity.

Flower and Hayes' (1981) cognitive process model conceptualizes writing as a recursive, goal-directed activity involving dynamic interaction among three major components: the task environment, the writer's long-term memory, and core cognitive processes—namely planning, translating, and reviewing. This model rejects the notion of writing as a linear or unitary skill and instead positions it as a complex orchestration of multiple sub-processes. Such a perspective

provides strong justification for the use of an analytic rubric, as it allows for the systematic examination of discrete yet interconnected aspects of writing performance.

Within this framework, grammatical accuracy corresponds primarily to the translating process, whereby ideas are encoded into linguistic form. This dimension reflects the writer's control over syntax, morphology, and lexical selection. It is conceptually distinct in that it focuses on the formal properties of language, which can be evaluated independently of higher-order concerns such as content development or discourse organization.

Structural coherence is associated with both the planning and reviewing processes, particularly in relation to the organization and logical sequencing of ideas. It encompasses the writer's ability to construct cohesive and unified texts through effective paragraphing, appropriate use of cohesive devices, and clear progression of ideas. Discourse-analytic research supports the distinction between coherence and grammatical accuracy, demonstrating that texts may exhibit linguistic correctness at the sentence level while lacking global organizational integrity.

Idea development aligns most closely with the planning component of the writing process. It reflects the generation, elaboration, and refinement of content, drawing on the writer's conceptual knowledge and rhetorical awareness. This dimension captures the depth, relevance, and support of ideas, and is conceptually independent of linguistic form. A text may demonstrate well-developed and logically structured ideas despite limitations in grammatical accuracy, underscoring the need to assess this dimension separately.

Clarity (explicitness) represents the overall communicative effectiveness of the text and emerges from the interaction of planning, translating, and reviewing processes. It reflects the extent to which ideas are expressed in a precise, accessible, and reader-oriented manner. While related to both coherence and grammatical accuracy, clarity is conceptually distinct in that it prioritizes the successful transmission of meaning to the reader rather than the correctness or organization of language in isolation.

Further theoretical support for this multidimensional framework is provided by Hyland (2003, 2019), who emphasizes that effective writing involves the integration of linguistic, rhetorical, and communicative competencies. Hyland's work in second language writing highlights the

importance of evaluating writing across multiple domains, including language use, discourse organization, and audience awareness. In a similar vein, Cummins' (2000) distinction between Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) reinforces the need to differentiate between surface-level linguistic control and higher-order academic writing abilities, particularly in bilingual contexts.

The four rubric dimensions adopted in this study are theoretically grounded in well-established models of writing competence. Each dimension captures a distinct aspect of writing—linguistic accuracy, organizational structure, conceptual development, and communicative clarity—while collectively providing a comprehensive and analytically rigorous framework for assessment. This theoretical alignment enhances the construct validity of the instrument and supports a nuanced interpretation of writing performance across multiple dimensions.

3.8 Inter-Rater Reliability

To ensure the reliability and objectivity of the scoring process, inter-rater reliability was systematically established. Two independent raters evaluated students' written texts using a standardized analytic scoring rubric comprising multiple dimensions, including grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity. Prior to the formal rating process, both raters participated in a calibration session to develop a shared understanding of the rubric criteria, scoring scales, and performance descriptors. This initial training was intended to minimize subjective variation and promote consistency in rating practices.

Ten scripts from each writing level (sentence, paragraph, and essay), representing approximately 33.3% of the total dataset, were randomly selected and independently scored by both raters. Inter-rater agreement was assessed using the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC), calculated based on a two-way random-effects model with absolute agreement, which is appropriate for evaluating consistency in composite scores derived from analytic rubrics. The analysis yielded an ICC value of approximately 0.95, indicating excellent inter-rater reliability. In line with established interpretive guidelines, ICC values above 0.90 are considered to reflect a very high level of agreement, suggesting that the scoring process was highly consistent, stable, and dependable across raters.

In addition, weighted Cohen's Kappa (κ) was computed to assess agreement at the level of individual rubric components, taking into account the ordinal nature of the rating scale. The kappa coefficients across the scoring categories ranged approximately between 0.85 and 0.93, indicating almost perfect agreement based on widely accepted interpretive guidelines. The use of weighted kappa further strengthens the reliability assessment by accounting for the degree of disagreement between raters rather than treating all discrepancies equally.

Following the independent scoring process, any minor discrepancies identified between raters were reviewed and resolved through discussion to reach consensus scores. This step ensured the accuracy and consistency of the final dataset used for subsequent statistical analyses.

The convergence of high ICC and kappa values provides strong empirical evidence for the reliability and consistency of the scoring procedures. These results enhance the methodological rigor of the study and support the validity of the conclusions drawn from the writing performance data.

3.9 Data Analysis

Two sets of data were collected and analyzed in this study: quantitative data derived from students' post-test results and qualitative data obtained from semi-structured teacher interviews. The post-test scores provided measurable evidence of students' writing performance across multiple dimensions and levels, while the interview data offered in-depth insights into teachers' perspectives on the pedagogical use of code-switching in English language instruction.

3.9.1 Analysis of Quantitative Data

Given the quantitative orientation of the study, statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 26 to process and interpret the data gathered from the post-test. The primary aim of the analysis was to examine the relative effectiveness of code-switching (CS) and English-only (EO) instructional approaches on students' writing performance across multiple dimensions and levels of complexity.

To evaluate differences in overall writing achievement between the experimental (CS) and control (EO) groups, an independent samples t-test was employed. This analysis addressed

Objectives 1 through 7 by comparing the post-test mean scores of the two groups to determine whether any observed differences were statistically significant. Although the study adopted a pretest–posttest design, the pretest functioned primarily as a grouping mechanism to ensure initial comparability between participants. A preliminary independent samples t-test conducted on pretest scores confirmed that there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups at baseline. This justified the use of an unadjusted post-test comparison. While an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) could have been applied to control for pretest variability, its use was deemed unnecessary given the equivalence of the groups prior to the intervention.

In relation to Objectives 5 and 6, which required a more fine-grained analysis of performance across writing dimensions (grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity) and across writing levels (sentence, paragraph, and essay), both independent samples t-tests and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted. The t-tests enabled pairwise comparisons between the CS and EO groups within each writing dimension and level, while the ANOVA facilitated examination of variation within groups across different writing levels. This dual analytical approach allowed for a more comprehensive understanding of whether the instructional approach had differential effects on specific aspects of writing or at particular levels of task complexity.

In addition to tests of statistical significance, effect sizes were calculated using Cohen's d to assess the magnitude of observed differences between groups. This was particularly important given the relatively small sample size ($n = 33$), which may limit the statistical power of the analyses. Reporting effect sizes provided a more nuanced interpretation of the findings by distinguishing between statistically non-significant results and those that may still reflect small or moderate practical differences.

Furthermore, all statistical tests were conducted at a significance level of $p < .05$. Assumptions underlying parametric tests, including normality and homogeneity of variance, were checked prior to analysis to ensure the appropriateness of the selected statistical procedures. Where necessary, results were interpreted cautiously in light of these assumptions and the sample size constraints.

The combination of independent samples t-tests, one-way ANOVA, and effect size calculations provided a robust analytical framework for examining the impact of instructional language on students' writing performance, while also allowing for careful interpretation of findings within the methodological limitations of the study.

3.9.2 Qualitative Data Analysis: Thematic Analysis Procedures

The qualitative data obtained from the semi-structured interviews with English language teachers were analyzed using thematic analysis, following the procedures outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006, 2019). This approach was selected due to its flexibility and its suitability for identifying patterns of meaning in relation to pedagogical practices and teacher perceptions of code-switching in multilingual classrooms. The analysis was conducted in a manner that ensured direct alignment between the interview guide, the emergent themes, and the presentation of findings in the results.

The thematic analysis was guided by the four core areas addressed in the interview protocol: (1) the use and rationale of code-switching, (2) its influence on student comfort and participation, (3) its perceived effect on academic performance, and (4) its role in supporting writing at different levels. These domains provided an initial analytic framework, which was subsequently refined through inductive coding procedures.

In the first phase, all interview recordings were transcribed verbatim. The researcher engaged in repeated readings of the transcripts to achieve familiarity with the data and to identify initial patterns. During this stage, analytic memos were recorded to capture emerging insights related to the research objectives, particularly in relation to how teachers justified their use of code-switching and how they perceived its impact on student learning.

In the second phase, initial coding was conducted using a hybrid approach combining deductive and inductive strategies. Deductive codes were derived directly from the interview questions (e.g., use of code-switching, student comfort, academic performance, writing level), while inductive codes emerged from participants' responses (e.g., clarifying complex grammar, reducing anxiety, enhancing participation, supporting idea organization). Coding was applied

systematically across the dataset, with each relevant segment of text assigned one or more codes. The coding framework was continuously refined to ensure conceptual clarity and consistency.

In the third phase, codes were grouped into broader categories and subsequently developed into themes. These themes were then explicitly mapped onto the structure used in Chapter 4 for the presentation of qualitative findings. The following thematic categories were established:

Theme 1: Code-switching as a pedagogical and scaffolding strategy (aligned with Chapter 4 discussion of instructional rationale), capturing teachers' intentional use of L1 to explain complex concepts, clarify instructions, and facilitate comprehension.

Theme 2: Code-switching and student comfort and participation (aligned with Chapter 4 findings on affective factors), reflecting teachers' observations that code-switching reduces anxiety and increases student engagement and classroom interaction.

Theme 3: Perceived impact of code-switching on academic performance (aligned with Chapter 4 comparison of qualitative and quantitative findings), highlighting teachers' belief that code-switching supports learning outcomes, particularly at lower proficiency levels.

Theme 4: Code-switching in writing instruction across levels (aligned with Chapter 4 analysis of writing performance by level), focusing on teachers' views regarding the role of code-switching in supporting writing, especially at the paragraph level through idea generation and organization.

In the fourth phase, each theme was reviewed, defined, and supported with representative excerpts from the interview data. The themes were then integrated into Chapter 4, where they were presented alongside quantitative findings for each corresponding research objective. This integration ensured that qualitative insights were not treated in isolation but were used to contextualize and interpret the statistical results. For instance, teachers' perceptions of the benefits of code-switching were systematically compared with the quantitative finding of no statistically significant differences between instructional approaches.

The final phase involved cross-referencing the qualitative themes with the quantitative results to identify areas of convergence and divergence. This process was central to the mixed-methods design of the study, as it enabled the researcher to distinguish between perceived pedagogical

effectiveness and empirically measurable outcomes. As reflected in Chapter 4, while teachers consistently viewed code-switching as beneficial for comprehension, confidence, and early-stage learning, these perceived advantages did not correspond to statistically significant differences in writing performance.

To ensure the trustworthiness of the qualitative analysis, several strategies were employed. Credibility was enhanced through careful alignment between the interview guide, coding process, and thematic development, as well as through prolonged engagement with the data. Member checking was conducted by sharing summarized interpretations with the participants to verify the accuracy of the findings. Peer debriefing was undertaken through consultation with a colleague experienced in qualitative research, who reviewed selected transcripts and coding decisions. Dependability was supported by maintaining a detailed audit trail documenting all stages of analysis, including coding revisions and theme development. Confirmability was ensured through reflexive practices, with the researcher systematically grounding interpretations in the data and minimizing subjective bias.

The thematic analysis was conducted in a systematic and transparent manner, with explicit alignment between data collection, analysis, and reporting. By directly linking themes to both the interview guide and the presentation of findings in Chapter 4, the study ensures methodological coherence and strengthens the validity of the qualitative strand within the mixed-methods framework.

In conclusion, the combination of quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures provided a comprehensive and methodologically coherent basis for examining the effect of code-switching on students' English writing performance. The statistical analyses conducted on post-test scores offered objective, measurable evidence of differences between the code-switching and English-only groups across multiple writing dimensions and levels, while the thematic analysis of teacher interview data provided contextual and pedagogical explanations for classroom practices and perceived learner outcomes. By integrating these two strands, the study was able to move beyond isolated statistical comparisons to develop a more nuanced interpretation of the findings, distinguishing between measurable writing performance and teachers' experiential and instructional perspectives. This methodological triangulation strengthened the validity of the

study and enabled a more balanced understanding of how code-switching functions within multilingual writing classrooms.

3.10 Addressing Ethical Issues

In conducting the study, several ethical considerations were addressed to protect the rights and well-being of the participants involved. Informed consent was obtained from all participants after they were fully informed about the purpose, procedures, and potential implications of the study. Participation was entirely voluntary, and all participants were made aware of their right to withdraw at any time without any negative consequences.

To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, participants' personal information and writing samples were coded, and all data were securely stored. The study design ensured that the code-switching practices implemented did not negatively impact the participants' learning experiences or academic performance. The research was conducted with a strong commitment to cultural and linguistic sensitivity, acknowledging and respecting the backgrounds of the participants. The results were interpreted responsibly, with care taken to avoid misuse or misrepresentation of the findings. Furthermore, all information was used strictly for the purposes of this study.

3.11 Analysis and Discussion of the Pilot Study Results, Summary of the Findings, and Lessons Learned from the Pilot Study

This section presents the analysis and discussion of the pilot study results, summarizes key findings, and outlines lessons learned. These insights have informed methodological adjustments for the main study to improve its validity and implementation.

3.11.1 Participant grouping

Since the present study was a quasi-experimental type, the participants were grouped into two groups: the controlled group and the experimental group. The pretest was conducted prior to the implementation of the instructional intervention to establish baseline equivalence between the two groups.

As shown in Table 3.1, the mean pretest scores of the two groups were nearly identical, with only slight, likely unavoidable, differences. To minimize potential disparities, individual student scores were first arranged in descending order, and then assigned to groups by alternating placement—students with odd-numbered rankings were placed in one group, and those with even-numbered rankings in the other.

Table 3.1: The pretest results between groups

	Mean of sentence writing		Mean of paragraph writing		Mean of essay writing		Total mean	
Groups	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
English only	33	5.2727	33	5.1212	32	4.7500	32	5.0000
Code switching	35	5.5429	35	5.1429	35	4.6571	35	5.1143

* One of the participants skipped the essay writing section of the pretest

In terms of sentence writing, the code-switching group (N = 35) achieved a slightly higher mean score (M = 5.54) compared to the English-only group (N = 33, M = 5.27). A similar trend was observed in the paragraph writing task, where the code-switching group obtained a mean score of 5.14, while the English-only group scored a mean of 5.12. These differences, though minimal, suggest a marginal initial advantage for the code-switching group in these two components of writing. However, in the essay writing task, a slight reversal is observed: the English-only group (N = 32, M = 4.75) performed marginally better than the code-switching group (N = 35, M = 4.66). It is worth noting that one participant in the English-only group did not complete the essay writing task, resulting in a slightly reduced sample size for that component.

When considering the total mean scores across all three tasks, the code-switching group again demonstrated a slight overall advantage with a mean score of 5.11, compared to the English-only group's mean of 5.00. Although the differences across all writing tasks are relatively small, the near equivalence in pretest performance suggests that the two groups were comparably matched in writing ability prior to the intervention. This balance is critical for ensuring the internal validity of the study, as it indicates that any significant differences observed in posttest performance can more confidently be attributed to the instructional variable—namely, the use or non-use of code-switching—rather than to pre-existing disparities in writing proficiency.

3.11.2 Biographical information about the participants

A total of sixty-eight undergraduate students participated in the pilot study, including forty-one males and twenty-seven females, all of whom were enrolled in Sophomore English course at the time. To support the experimental research design, students' pretest scores were first arranged in descending order, after which they were assigned to two groups using an alternating placement method—students with odd-numbered rankings were placed in one group, and those with even-numbered rankings in the other. Using lottery method, Section One, comprising thirty-three students, was designated as the English-only group. This control group received instruction exclusively in English, with no code-switching permitted during teaching and learning activities. Section Two consisted of thirty-five (one student from odd ranking joined this section because of health related reason) students and served as the experimental group. In this code-switching group, the learners' L1 was strategically incorporated alongside English during instruction to investigate its potential impact on writing performance.

All sixty-eight students initially participated in the pretest, which assessed three distinct levels of writing proficiency: sentence-level, paragraph-level, and essay-level writing. Following the instructional intervention, a posttest was administered to assess the impact of the two instructional approaches on students' writing performance across the same three levels. However, due to the staggered scheduling of the posttest components, some students were unable to complete all sections. Specifically, five students—two from the control group and three from the experimental group—did not complete the sentence writing posttest. Similarly, four students—two from each group—missed the paragraph writing component. With regard to the essay writing posttest, two students from the control group and three from the experimental group were absent. These absences were taken into account during data analysis to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the results.

3.11.3 Effect of instructional types on students' sentence writing performance

This section presents a comparative analysis of the mean scores obtained by participants on the sentence writing component of the assessment. The analysis specifically focuses on two key features of writing—structure and language—as well as the overall sentence writing performance. The aim is to determine whether there are significant differences in these aspects of

writing between the English-only group (control) and the code-switching group (experimental). The comparison of means was conducted using an independent-samples t-test, allowing for a statistical evaluation of the effect of instructional approach on students' sentence-level writing proficiency.

3.11.3.1 Comparison of mean scores of students' writing performance on features of writing between groups

In order to evaluate students' sentence-level writing performance more comprehensively, the items included in the data collection checklist were classified into two major categories: structural features and language features of writing. This classification allowed for a more detailed analysis of the components contributing to overall writing competence.

The structure-related items assessed the students' ability to produce coherent and logically organized sentences. Specifically, these items examined whether students effectively used appropriate cohesive devices to join ideas, whether the word order within sentences adhered to standard syntactic conventions, whether the sentences conveyed complete and meaningful ideas, and whether the sentence structures were logically acceptable within the context of written discourse.

On the other hand, the language-related items focused on the students' command of grammatical accuracy and correctness. This included evaluation of correct spelling, appropriate use of verb tenses, proper punctuation, grammatical accuracy in sentence construction, clarity of antecedent-pronoun relationships, and the maintenance of correct subject-verb agreement. Together, these features provided a robust framework for assessing both the mechanical and syntactic accuracy of sentence writing.

This section presents the results of a comparative analysis of students' performance on these features between the English-only group (control) and the code-switching group (experimental). An independent-samples t-test was conducted using SPSS Version 26 to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in mean scores between the two groups in both structural and language aspects of sentence writing. The statistical analysis aimed to establish whether the

use of code-switching as an instructional strategy had a measurable impact on students' performance in specific features of sentence-level writing.

3.11.3.1.1 Comparison of mean of students' writing performance on language as a feature of writing between the groups

Table 3.2 displays the results of an independent-samples t-test comparing the performance of the English-only group and the code-switching group on language-related features of sentence writing. These features include spelling, tense consistency, punctuation, grammatical accuracy, pronoun-antecedent clarity, and subject-verb agreement.

The mean score for the code-switching group (M = 3.23, SD = 0.41) was notably higher than that of the English-only group (M = 2.83, SD = 0.71), indicating that students exposed to instruction involving code-switching performed better in the language aspects of sentence writing.

Table 3.1 Comparison of performance on language features (LFW) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	2.83	.71	.13	8.886	.004	-2.69	47.385	.01	.7
Code switching	32	3.23	.41	.07						

The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances yielded a statistically significant result (F = 8.886, p = .004), suggesting that the assumption of equal variances was violated. As a result, the t-test was interpreted using Welch's correction for unequal variances, which adjusts the degrees of freedom accordingly.

The t-test results (t = -2.69, df = 47.385, p = .01) indicate a statistically significant difference in performance between the two groups at the $p < .05$ level. The negative t-value reflects that the English-only group had a lower mean than the code-switching group. Moreover, the effect size, as measured by Cohen's d = 0.70, represents a moderate to large effect, indicating that the observed difference in language performance is not only statistically significant but also educationally meaningful.

These findings suggest that the use of code-switching as a pedagogical strategy may positively influence students' mastery of language features in writing. The improved performance among students in the experimental group supports the hypothesis that code-switching can serve as an effective scaffolding tool for enhancing linguistic accuracy in L2 writing contexts.

3.11.3.1.2 Comparison of mean of students' writing performance on structure as a feature of writing between the groups

Table 3.3 presents the results of an independent-samples t-test comparing students' performance on structural features of sentence writing between the English-only group and the code-switching group. Structural features in this context refer to elements such as logical sentence construction, appropriate use of cohesive devices, correct word order, and the ability to produce complete, coherent, and logically connected sentences.

Table 3.1: Comparison of performance on structure features between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	3.07	0.75	0.13	16.325	0.000	-2.953	48.247	0.005	0.77
code switching	32	3.53	0.44	0.08						

The data indicate that the code-switching group (M = 3.53, SD = 0.44) outperformed the English-only group (M = 3.07, SD = 0.75) in structural features of writing. The standard deviation is lower in the code-switching group, suggesting more consistent performance among students in that group. The result of Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was significant (F = 16.325, p = .000), indicating a violation of the assumption of equal variances. Therefore, the Welch's t-test was used, which adjusts the degrees of freedom to account for this discrepancy.

The t-test revealed a statistically significant difference between the two groups (t = -2.953, df = 48.247, p = .005). The negative t-value again reflects that the English-only group had a lower mean score compared to the code-switching group. The p-value is less than 0.01, indicating strong statistical significance. Furthermore, the calculated Cohen's d value of 0.77 signifies a large effect size, suggesting that the use of code-switching had a meaningful and substantial impact on students' ability to construct well-structured sentences.

These findings reinforce the conclusion that code-switching as an instructional strategy not only supports linguistic accuracy but also enhances students' ability to organize and structure their ideas more effectively in written English. This provides empirical support for incorporating learners' first language strategically to scaffold complex L2 writing skills.

3.11.3.2 Comparison of mean of students' overall sentence writing performance (SWP) between groups

This section presents a comparative analysis of students' overall sentence writing performance, with language and structural features considered in aggregate. While Sections 3.9.3.1.1 and 3.9.3.1.2 separately examined students' performance on the individual components of sentence writing—namely, language features and structural features—the current section focuses on the total mean performance to provide a more comprehensive picture of students' sentence-level writing proficiency.

Table 3.1 Differences in sentence writing performance between EO and CS groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	2.92	.70	.13	13.74	0.00	-2.939	45.620	0.005	0.78
code switching	32	3.34	.38	.07						

Table 3.4 summarizes the results of an independent-samples t-test conducted to compare the overall sentence writing performance between students taught through English-only instruction (EO group) and those taught using code-switching (CS group). This aggregated measure includes both structural and language features of writing.

The data indicate that the code-switching group (M = 3.34, SD = 0.38) outperformed the English-only group (M = 2.92, SD = 0.70) in overall sentence writing performance. The higher mean score and smaller standard deviation in the code-switching group suggest not only better performance but also more consistency among learners. A Levene's Test for Equality of Variances indicated a significant result (F = 13.74, p = 0.00), meaning the assumption of equal variances was violated. Accordingly, the Welch's t-test was applied, which adjusts degrees of freedom to account for this discrepancy in variance.

The results of the t-test (t = -2.939, df = 45.620, p = 0.005) show a statistically significant difference in sentence writing performance between the two groups at the p < .01 level. The negative t-value reflects the lower mean score of the English-only group in comparison to the code-switching group. The effect size, measured by Cohen's d = 0.78, indicates a large effect, suggesting that the use of code-switching had a substantial and meaningful impact on students' overall sentence writing ability.

These findings provide robust evidence that code-switching as an instructional approach contributes positively to students' sentence-level writing development. The significant improvement in performance across both language and structural dimensions supports the pedagogical value of integrating learners' first language as a scaffold in the second language writing classroom.

3.11.4 Effect of instructional types on students' paragraph writing performance

3.11.4.1 Comparison of mean scores of students' writing performance on paragraph-level features between groups

This section presents a detailed comparative analysis of students' paragraph-level writing performance, focusing on four core features of effective writing: language**,** structure**,** idea development, and explicitness. These elements were operationalized through a set of evaluative criteria designed to capture both the linguistic and rhetorical quality of students' writing.

The language dimension included items assessing the grammatical accuracy of sentence construction, correct spelling, proper use of punctuation, and the appropriate use of verb tenses, which collectively reflect the students' command of language mechanics in the context of paragraph writing. The structure component was evaluated based on the presence of a clear introduction, coherent sentence arrangement, effective segmentation of ideas into distinct sentences, logical linkage between sentences within a paragraph, and the inclusion of a well-crafted conclusion. These criteria are essential for determining the internal organization and cohesion of a paragraph.

The feature of idea development addressed whether students were able to present adequate supporting points for their topic sentence, incorporate credible evidence to substantiate their claims, and integrate ideas from external sources seamlessly with their own arguments. This aspect of writing is critical in academic discourse where logical reasoning and evidence-based writing are emphasized. Explicitness, as a writing quality, was examined by evaluating whether key concepts were clearly defined, whether the paragraph's objectives were clearly articulated, and whether appropriate linking words and transitions were used to clarify relationships between ideas. These indicators reflect the clarity and reader accessibility of the writing.

The comparison of performance between the control group (English-only instruction) and the experimental group (code-switching instruction) was conducted using independent-samples t-tests via SPSS version 26. The analyses were carried out individually for each of the four features, followed by a comparison of the aggregate mean performance across all features. This approach enables a nuanced understanding of the impact of instructional language on different dimensions of paragraph writing proficiency.

3.11.4.1.1 Comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance (PWP) on language as a feature of writing (LFW) between the groups

Comparison was made to see the difference of the mean performance of groups on LFW on the posttest. As presented in Table 3.5 below, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the performance of LFW in PWP for English only and code-switching groups.

Table 3.1: Comparison of paragraph writing performance on language features (LFW) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	2.68	0.67	0.12	0.120	0.731	-1.876	62	0.065	0.47
code switching	33	2.98	0.61	0.10						

As reported in Table 3.5 the mean score for the code-switching group (M = 2.98, SD = 0.61) was higher than that of the English-only group (M = 2.68, SD = 0.67), suggesting that students who were exposed to instruction incorporating code-switching demonstrated somewhat better

command of language at the paragraph level. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was not significant ($F = 0.120$, $p = 0.731$), indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met. Therefore, the standard t-test output was used for interpretation.

The t-test result ($t = -1.876$, $df = 62$, $p = 0.065$) approached, but did not reach, conventional levels of statistical significance (typically $p < 0.05$). While the observed difference in means suggests a positive trend in favor of the code-switching group, this result should be interpreted with caution, as it did not meet the threshold for statistical reliability. However, the effect size, measured by Cohen's $d = 0.47$, indicates a moderate practical effect. This suggests that, although the difference was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, the use of code-switching may still have a meaningful impact on students' ability to apply language features effectively in paragraph writing.

While the results do not allow for definitive claims about the superiority of code-switching in this area, they do indicate a promising trend that warrants further investigation with larger sample sizes or over extended instructional periods.

3.11.4.1.2 Comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance (PWP) on structure as a feature of writing (SFW) between the groups

Table 3.6 presents the results of an independent-samples t-test that assessed differences between the EO group and the CS group in terms of their performance on structural features of paragraph writing. These features included the presence of a clear introduction and conclusion, logical arrangement of sentences, appropriate segmentation into sentences, and the effective use of cohesive devices to ensure intra-paragraph coherence.

The mean score for the code-switching group was slightly higher ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 0.73$) than that of the English-only group ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 0.74$), suggesting a marginal advantage for students exposed to instruction that incorporated code-switching in organizing their paragraph structures. The result of Levene's Test for Equality of Variances ($F = 0.201$, $p = 0.655$) was not statistically significant, confirming that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met and that the standard t-test could be applied.

Table 3.1: Comparison of paragraph writing performance (PWP) on structure features (SFW) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	2.71	.74	.13	.201	.655	-.955	62	.343	0.48
code switching	33	2.88	.73	.13						

The t-test result (t = -0.955, df = 62, p = 0.343) revealed no statistically significant difference in the performance of the two groups on structural features at the paragraph level. The p-value exceeds the commonly accepted threshold ($p < 0.05$), indicating that any observed difference in mean scores may be attributable to chance rather than the instructional method. However, the Cohen's d value of 0.48 reflects a moderate effect size, suggesting that although the result is not statistically significant, the difference may still hold practical significance, especially in classroom contexts where nuanced improvements in structural competence are valued over time.

In conclusion, while the data do not indicate a statistically significant advantage for the code-switching group in paragraph structure, the moderate effect size hints at potential pedagogical benefits of code-switching that may emerge more clearly with prolonged exposure or in larger samples.

3.11.4.1.3 Comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance (PWP) on idea development as a feature of writing (IDFW) between the groups

Table 3.7 reports the results of an independent-samples t-test conducted to examine differences in students' performance on idea development features in paragraph writing between the English-only and code-switching instructional groups. The idea development component evaluated the extent to which students were able to generate and support claims with sufficient, credible evidence, and smoothly integrate external sources and personal insights in a coherent manner.

The mean score of the code-switching group (M = 2.82, SD = 0.66) was higher than that of the English-only group (M = 2.49, SD = 0.53), indicating that students who received instruction incorporating code-switching demonstrated stronger idea development skills in their paragraph

writing. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances yielded a non-significant result (F = 1.229, p = 0.272), confirming that the assumption of equal variances was not violated. Thus, the standard independent-samples t-test output is valid for interpretation.

Table 3.1: Comparison of paragraph writing performance (PWP) on Idea development features (IDFW) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	2.49	.53	.09	1.229	.272	-2.161	62	.035	0.56
code switching	33	2.82	.66	.11						

The t-test result (t = -2.161, df = 62, p = 0.035) indicates a statistically significant difference in performance at the p < .05 level, favoring the code-switching group. This suggests that instructional practices involving code-switching may contribute positively to students' ability to construct and support ideas effectively in paragraph writing. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's d = 0.56, represents a moderate effect, reinforcing the practical significance of the finding. This implies that, beyond statistical significance, the difference is likely to be meaningful in educational contexts, particularly in enhancing students' critical thinking and coherence in written communication.

The results suggest that code-switching has a beneficial impact on students' development of ideas in writing, offering support for the strategic integration of learners' first language in second language writing instruction.

3.11.4.1.4 Comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance (PWP) on explicitness as a feature of writing (EFW) between the groups

Table 3.8 displays the results of an independent-samples t-test conducted to compare the performance of students in the English-only group and the code-switching group on the explicitness features of paragraph writing. These features assess the clarity and transparency of the paragraph, including whether key concepts were clearly defined, the paragraph's objectives

were explicitly stated, and appropriate linking devices were used to signal relationships between ideas.

Table 3.1: Comparison of paragraph writing performance (PWP) on explicitness features (EFW) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	2.54	.60	.11	.174	.678	-2.131	62	.037	0.53
code switching	33	2.87	.64	.11						

The mean score for the code-switching group (M = 2.87, SD = 0.64) was higher than that of the English-only group (M = 2.54, SD = 0.60), suggesting that students exposed to code-switching instruction demonstrated greater clarity and explicitness in their paragraph writing. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances (F = 0.174, p = 0.678) was not statistically significant, confirming that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met, and thus the results of the standard t-test are valid.

The t-test results (t = -2.131, df = 62, p = 0.037) reveal a statistically significant difference in the performance between the two groups at the $p < .05$ level. This suggests that the code-switching group performed significantly better in articulating clear and explicit written ideas at the paragraph level. Furthermore, the effect size, calculated using Cohen's d = 0.53, reflects a moderate effect, indicating that the observed difference is not only statistically significant but also educationally meaningful. The use of code-switching in instruction appears to have had a positive influence on students' ability to clearly express the purpose and structure of their written work.

The findings suggest that code-switching as a pedagogical strategy contributes significantly to enhancing the explicitness of students' writing. This provides empirical support for its integration in second language writing classrooms where clarity of expression is a key academic writing objective.

3.11.4.2 Comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance (PWP) between the groups

This section presents the comparison of the students' overall PWP in general. This encompasses the mean value of all fifteen items which are categorized under features of writing (language, structure, idea development and explicitness) to assess the PWP. In the previous sections (3.9.4.1.1, 3.9.4.1.2, 3.9.4.1.3, and 3.9.4.1.4) the comparison of students' performance on features of writing (language, structure, idea development and explicitness) were separately presented. Nevertheless, this section presents the comparison of total mean of PWP between groups.

The comparison of mean of students' paragraph writing performance between the groups was conducted to examine which instructional type (CS or EO) yields higher performance of students' paragraph writing. The comparison of the mean result of the controlled group (EO) and the experimental group (CS) was compared using SPSS 26 (an independent- samples t-test). Thus, an independent-samples t-test, as in Table 3.9 below, was conducted to compare the performance of paragraph writing for English only and code-switching groups.

This aggregated measure includes all four assessed features of paragraph writing: language, structure, idea development, and explicitness. The mean performance score of the code-switching group (M = 2.89, SD = 0.62) exceeded that of the English-only group (M = 2.63, SD = 0.57), indicating that, overall, students in the code-switching group demonstrated stronger paragraph writing skills across the assessed dimensions. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances (F = 0.137, p = 0.713) was not statistically significant, indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met and the standard t-test results could be interpreted.

Table 3.1: Differences in paragraph writing performance (PWP) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	2.63	.57	.10	.137	.713	-1.791	62	.078	0.46
code switching	33	2.89	.62	.11						

The t-test result ($t = -1.791$, $df = 62$, $p = 0.078$) did not reach the conventional level of statistical significance ($p < .05$). However, the result approaches significance and may be considered marginally significant, particularly in exploratory or educational research contexts where practical implications are emphasized. The effect size, Cohen's $d = 0.46$, indicates a moderate practical effect, suggesting that while the result is not statistically significant, the observed difference in paragraph writing performance may still have pedagogical relevance, particularly in settings where incremental improvements are meaningful for student development.

Although the difference in overall paragraph writing performance between the two instructional groups is not statistically significant, the trend and the moderate effect size support the potential effectiveness of code-switching in improving writing performance. These findings underscore the need for further investigation with larger samples and longitudinal designs to validate and expand upon these promising results.

3.11.5 Effect of instructional types on students' essay writing performance

3.11.5.1 Comparison of mean essay writing performance (EWP) on features of writing between groups

This section presents a comparative analysis of students' Essay Writing Performance (EWP) based on four core features of academic writing: language**,** structure**,** idea development, and explicitness. The objective is to assess the impact of instructional type—English-only versus code-switching —on students' performance across these dimensions.

The analysis first compares the mean scores of the two instructional groups on each of the individual features mentioned above. Following this, the aggregate performance—combining all four features—is compared between the groups to evaluate the overall impact of instructional type on essay writing proficiency.

The comparisons were conducted using independent-samples t-tests on SPSS version 26, providing statistical rigor to determine whether any observed differences in mean scores are statistically significant. The results inform whether the use of code-switching in instruction contributes meaningfully to improved essay writing outcomes in English language classrooms.

3.11.5.1.1 Comparison of mean of students' essay writing performance (EWP) on language as a feature of writing (LFW) between the groups

This category encompasses fundamental aspects of language use in academic composition, including the grammatical accuracy, spelling, punctuation, and tense usage in students' written essays. Table 3.10 presents the results of an independent-samples t-test conducted to compare the performance of students in the English-only and code-switching instructional groups on language features within essay writing.

Table 3.1: Comparison of essay writing performance (EWP) on language features (LFW) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	3.07	.84	.15	10.08	.002	-2.832	47.37	.007	0.74
code switching	32	3.56	.48	.08						

The mean score for the code-switching group (M = 3.56, SD = 0.48) was notably higher than that of the English-only group (M = 3.07, SD = 0.84), indicating that students who received instruction through code-switching performed better in terms of language accuracy and proficiency. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances produced a statistically significant result (F = 10.08, p = .002), suggesting that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated. As a result, the t-test was interpreted using adjusted degrees of freedom (df = 47.37).

The results of the t-test revealed a statistically significant difference between the two groups (t = -2.832, p = .007), indicating that the difference in language performance is unlikely to have occurred by chance. This suggests that the code-switching instructional method had a significant positive impact on students' ability to use English accurately in their essay writing. The effect size, calculated as Cohen's d = 0.74, reflects a moderate to large effect, providing further evidence that the difference in performance is both statistically and practically meaningful. This implies that incorporating code-switching in English language instruction can substantially enhance students' mastery of essential language mechanics in academic writing.

The results suggest that code-switching can serve as an effective pedagogical tool in improving students' language usage in essay writing, likely by facilitating better comprehension of grammatical rules and reducing cognitive load associated with second language writing.

3.11.5.1.2 Comparison of mean of students' essay writing performance (EWP) on structure as a feature of writing (SFW) between the groups

Structural features in this context include the presence of a clear introduction, coherent arrangement of sentences, logical paragraph segmentation, effective transitions, and a well-formulated conclusion—components essential to the organization and clarity of academic writing. Table 3.11 displays the results of an independent-samples t-test comparing the structural features of essay writing between students in the English-only and code-switching instructional groups.

Table 3.1: Comparison of essay writing performance (EWP) on structure as feature of writing (SFW) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	2.63	.88	.16	7.142	.01	-1.648	53.973	.105	0.43
code switching	32	2.94	.62	.11						

The mean score of the code-switching group (M = 2.94, SD = 0.62) was higher than that of the English-only group (M = 2.63, SD = 0.88), suggesting that students taught with code-switching demonstrated stronger structural organization in their essays. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances revealed a statistically significant difference in variances (F = 7.142, p = .01), which required the use of adjusted degrees of freedom (df = 53.973) for the subsequent t-test.

The t-test result (t = -1.648, p = .105) did not reach statistical significance at the conventional $\alpha = 0.05$ level. This indicates that, although the mean difference favors the code-switching group, the observed disparity in structural performance cannot be confidently attributed to the instructional method alone within the limits of this sample. However, the calculated effect size (Cohen's d = 0.43) represents a moderate effect, suggesting a meaningful practical difference that may not have achieved statistical significance due to sample size limitations. This moderate effect hints at

the pedagogical potential of code-switching to support students in organizing their ideas more clearly and logically when writing extended texts such as essays.

While the difference in structural writing performance between the two groups did not reach statistical significance, the moderate effect size signals that code-switching may have a positive but subtle impact on students' structural competencies in essay writing. This finding warrants further investigation with larger or more diverse samples.

3.11.5.1.3 Comparison of mean of students' essay writing performance (EWP) on idea development as a feature of writing (IDFW) between the groups

This section is meant to compare the mean performance on IDFW between experimental and controlled groups. The idea development feature pertains to the generation and elaboration of content, including the presence of a clear thesis, the provision of relevant and sufficient supporting details, integration of credible evidence, and the appropriate citation and connection of external sources. As the results in Table 3.12 below show the mean score for the code-switching group (M = 3.43, SD = 0.55) was notably higher than that of the English-only group (M = 2.86, SD = 0.87), suggesting that the students who received instruction via code-switching were better able to develop and substantiate their ideas effectively in their essays. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances indicated a significant difference in variance between the groups (F = 7.941, p = .007), necessitating the use of adjusted degrees of freedom (df = 50.321) in the t-test analysis.

Table 3.1: Comparison of essay writing performance (EWP) on idea development as feature of writing (IDFW) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	2.86	.87	.15	7.941	.007	-3.089	50.321	.003	.8
code switching	32	3.43	.55	.10						

The independent-samples t-test revealed a statistically significant difference in mean scores (t = -3.089, p = .003), indicating that the instructional method had a meaningful impact on students' ability to develop ideas within their essays. The effect size (Cohen's d = 0.8) was large, signifying a strong practical significance in addition to the statistical significance. This

substantial difference supports the interpretation that code-switching, when strategically employed in English language instruction, significantly enhances students' capacity for idea development in academic writing. This may be attributed to the scaffolding function of code-switching, which likely facilitates deeper cognitive engagement and comprehension, especially when students are grappling with abstract or content-heavy writing tasks in a second language. The findings strongly suggest that code-switching can be a highly effective pedagogical tool in fostering richer, more coherent, and better-supported argumentation in student essay writing.

3.11.5.1.4 Comparison of mean of students' essay writing performance (EWP) on explicitness as a feature of writing (EFW) between the groups

Explicitness in writing refers to the clarity and precision with which ideas are expressed. This includes defining key concepts, clearly stating the purpose or goal of the essay, and using appropriate linking words and transitional phrases to establish logical connections among ideas.

Table 3.1: Comparison of essay writing performance (EWP) on explicitness as feature of writing (EFW) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	3.28	.80	.14	5.403	.023	-2.635	48.223	.011	.7
code switching	32	3.72	.47	.08						

Table 3.13 presents the results of an independent-samples t-test comparing students' performance on explicitness features of essay writing between the English-only and code-switching groups. The mean score for the code-switching group (M = 3.72, SD = 0.47) was significantly higher than that of the English-only group (M = 3.28, SD = 0.80), indicating that students who were taught using code-switching produced more explicit and clearly structured essays. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances indicated a significant variance difference between the groups (F = 5.403, p = .023), necessitating the use of adjusted degrees of freedom (df = 48.223) for the t-test calculation.

The results of the independent-samples t-test showed a statistically significant difference between the groups (t = -2.635, p = .011). This finding suggests that the code-switching

instructional method had a notable positive impact on students' ability to express their ideas explicitly and cohesively. The effect size (Cohen's d = 0.7) indicates a large effect, underscoring the practical significance of the result. The magnitude of this effect implies that code-switching not only aids linguistic comprehension but also contributes to greater conceptual clarity and logical organization in students' writing.

The analysis reveals that the code-switching approach significantly enhances students' performance on explicitness in essay writing, making their academic texts more transparent, purpose-driven, and reader-friendly. These results reinforce the pedagogical value of code-switching, particularly in helping learners articulate complex ideas more clearly in a second language context.

3.11.5.2 Comparison of mean of students' essay writing performance (EWP) between the groups

As it was presented in the previous sections (3.9.3.2 and 3.9.4.2) to compare the overall performance of students on sentence writing and paragraph writing respectively, this section of the paper also presents the comparison of the students' overall EWP. That means, it compares the mean value of all sixteen items which were categorized under four of the features of writing (language, structure, idea development and explicitness) to assess the EWP. In the previous sections (3.9.5.1.1, 3.9.5.1.2, 3.9.5.1.3, and 3.9.5.1.4) the performance of students on features of writing (language, structure, idea development and explicitness) were separately compared. This section, however, presents the comparison of total mean of EWP between groups. The total score aggregates performance across four key features of writing: language, structure, idea development, and explicitness.

Table 3.1: Differences in essay writing performance (EWP) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	31	2.95	.81	.14	10.301	.002	-2.779	47.504	.008	0.75
Code switching	32	3.42	.46	.08						

Table 3.14 presents the results of an independent-samples t-test conducted to compare the overall essay writing performance of students who received instruction in English only (EO group) with those who were taught through code-switching (CS group). The mean score of the code-switching group (M = 3.42, SD = 0.46) was substantially higher than that of the English-only group (M = 2.95, SD = 0.81), suggesting a marked advantage in overall essay writing performance for students taught through code-switching. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances revealed a significant difference in variance between the groups (F = 10.301, p = .002), warranting the application of adjusted degrees of freedom (df = 47.504) in the t-test.

The results of the independent-samples t-test showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups (t = -2.779, p = .008), indicating that the instructional strategy employed—whether monolingual (EO) or bilingual —had a significant impact on student performance. The effect size (Cohen's d = 0.75) was found to be large, pointing to a strong practical significance. This magnitude of difference implies that code-switching instruction yields a meaningful improvement in essay writing skills, beyond what would be expected by chance alone.

Taken together, these findings strongly suggest that the use of code-switching as a pedagogical strategy enhances students' overall essay writing proficiency. This advantage likely stems from the cognitive and linguistic support code-switching provides, which may help students organize their thoughts more effectively, articulate arguments more clearly, and integrate content more coherently in a second language academic context.

3.11.6 Comparison of students' writing performance within levels of writing between groups

Table 3.15 provides a detailed comparison of students' writing performance across three different writing levels—sentence writing (SWP), paragraph writing (PWP), and essay writing (EWP)—between the English-only and code-switching instructional groups. The table presents the mean scores (M), standard deviations (SD), and mean differences (MD) within each writing level.

Table 3.1: Comparison within levels of writing between groups

Group	SWP				PWP				EWP			
	N	M	SD	MD	N	M	SD	MD	N	M	SD	MD
English only	31	2.92	.70		31	2.62	.57		31	2.95	.81	
				.42				.27				.46
Code switching	32	3.34	.38		33	2.89	.62		32	3.42	.46	

At the sentence writing level (SWP), the code-switching group outperformed the English-only group, with the code-switching group achieving a mean score of 3.34 (SD = 0.38), compared to 2.92 (SD = 0.70) for the English-only group. The mean difference (MD) between the two groups at the sentence level was 0.42, indicating a moderate to large effect of code-switching on sentence-level writing. For paragraph writing (PWP), the mean score for the code-switching group was 2.89 (SD = 0.62), while the English-only group scored 2.62 (SD = 0.57). The mean difference at the paragraph level was 0.27, suggesting that while the code-switching group performed better, the difference between the two groups was smaller than at the sentence level. This difference may indicate that code-switching is particularly effective at supporting simpler writing tasks, such as sentence construction. At the essay writing level (EWP), the code-switching group again demonstrated superior performance, with a mean score of 3.42 (SD = 0.46), compared to the English-only group's score of 2.95 (SD = 0.81). The mean difference (MD) for essay writing was 0.46, representing a substantial improvement in the writing skills of the code-switching group at the essay level.

Overall, these results indicate that code-switching consistently enhances students' writing performance across all levels—sentence, paragraph, and essay. The greatest difference in performance between the two groups was observed at the sentence writing level, suggesting that code-switching may be especially effective in supporting the foundational aspects of writing, such as grammar and sentence structure. However, the consistent positive performance across all levels of writing shows that the benefits of code-switching extend beyond simple sentence construction, positively impacting more complex writing tasks as well. These findings provide further evidence that integrating code-switching as a teaching strategy in the English language

classroom may be particularly beneficial for improving students' writing performance, especially when students are required to produce more elaborate and extended texts.

3.11.7 Comparison within features of writing in WP between groups

This section presents the comparison of students' performance on four key features of writing across the English-only and code-switching instructional groups: language features (LFW)**,** structure features (SFW)**,** idea development features (IDFW), and explicitness features (EFW). In order to gain the result, the mean scores (M)**,** standard deviations (SD), and mean differences (MD) were compared as presented in Table 3.16 below.

At the language features level, the code-switching group scored higher, with a mean of 3.24 (SD = 0.32), compared to the English-only group, which had a mean of 2.93 (SD = 0.63). The mean difference (MD) between the two groups was 0.31, suggesting that code-switching significantly improves students' use of language in writing. This result indicates that code-switching facilitates the development of language proficiency, particularly in grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

Table 3.1: Comparison within features of writing in WP between groups

Group	LFW				SFW				IDFW				EFW			
	N	M	SD	MD	N	M	SD	MD	N	M	SD	MD	N	M	SD	MD
English only	27	2.93	.63		27	2.88	.66		29	2.72	.63		29	2.94	.57	
				.31				.26				.37				.33
Code switching	27	3.24	.32		27	3.13	.34		30	3.09	.38		30	3.28	.38	

In terms of structure features, the code-switching group again outperformed the English-only group, with a mean of 3.13 (SD = 0.34), compared to 2.88 (SD = 0.66) for the English-only group. The mean difference (MD) of 0.26 suggests a moderate effect of code-switching on improving students' ability to organize and structure their writing effectively. This difference indicates that students exposed to code-switching may have developed stronger organizational skills, such as paragraph coherence, sentence arrangement, and logical flow of ideas.

At the idea development features level, the code-switching group scored 3.09 (SD = 0.38)**,** which was noticeably higher than the English-only group's mean score of 2.72 (SD = 0.63)**.** The mean difference (MD) of 0.37 suggests that code-switching has a significant impact on students' ability to develop ideas effectively, support arguments with evidence, and integrate outside sources or prior knowledge into their writing. This indicates that students in the code-switching group were able to produce more detailed, well-supported, and coherent ideas in their writing.

Similarly, at the explicitness features level, the code-switching group showed superior performance, with a mean score of 3.28 (SD = 0.38)**,** compared to the English-only group's mean of 2.94 (SD = 0.57)**.** The mean difference (MD) of 0.33 highlights the positive effect of code-switching on making writing more explicit, such as clearly defining key concepts, outlining the goals of the writing, and using appropriate linking words to enhance clarity.

Across all four features of writing—language, structure, idea development, and explicitness—the code-switching group consistently outperformed the English-only group, with moderate to large mean differences observed in each feature. This suggests that code-switching enhances students' writing performance in multiple areas, particularly in terms of language proficiency, organization, and the development and clarity of ideas.

3.11.8 The comparison of overall performance in writing

The comparisons of means on particular features of writing (language, structure, idea development and explicitness), and the subtotal means on levels of writing (sentence, paragraph and essay) were made in the previous sections. This comparison is made to examine which instructional type (CS or EO) yields higher performance of students' overall writing. To this end, the total mean performance of students on sentence, paragraph and essay were transformed and computed in SPSS 26 to achieve the mean results for comparison. Hence, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the performance of overall writing performance (WP) for experimental and controlled groups as it is shown in Table 3.17 below.

The mean writing performance score for the code-switching group (M = 3.22, SD = 0.30) was notably higher than that of the English-only group (M = 2.91, SD = 0.61), indicating that students taught using a code-switching approach demonstrated a stronger overall command of

written English. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances revealed a significant difference in the variance between the groups (F = 10.205, p = .002), which justified the application of adjusted degrees of freedom (df = 37.619) in the subsequent t-test analysis.

Table 3.1: Differences in writing performance (WP) between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	27	2.91	.61	.12	10.205	.002	-2.368	37.619	.023	.69
code switching	27	3.22	.30	.06						

The independent-samples t-test yielded a statistically significant difference between the two instructional groups (t = -2.368, p = .023), confirming that the method of instruction had a significant impact on students' aggregate writing performance. The effect size (Cohen's d = 0.69) was calculated to be in the moderate-to-large range, highlighting a practically meaningful difference. This finding suggests that the positive effect of code-switching on writing development is not only statistically significant but also substantial enough to influence educational practices.

In conclusion, code-switching appears to support learners' ability to navigate and produce extended English texts more effectively across varying genres and writing tasks. The results substantiate the pedagogical value of strategically integrating students' first language in English language classrooms, especially in contexts where linguistic barriers may otherwise hinder academic expression and performance.

3.11.9 Analysis of data gathered from interview

Interview was conducted as a supportive tool of data gathering in order to get information about the overall condition of teachers' L1 use in the English classroom and the perceived reasons of teachers to use students' L1 or the other medium of instruction in the classroom. This section is, therefore, meant to present the analysis of the data collected from interview.

The data from the interview made clear that English language teachers use students first language in English language classroom even though the extent and the reasons why the teachers

use students' L1 vary from teacher to teacher. The common reason teachers mention is they use L1 in order to support students' understanding. Interviewee 1 (Mr. Darota) explains this: "It (mother tongue use) depends on the students' understanding. In most cases students don't understand when I use English only, so I see their understanding and use Dawrostuwa (Dawro language) in order to help them."

Mr Barata (interviewee 2) adds,

Most probably I use English but to some extent when students face difficulty to understand the content, I use local language specially Dawrogna language. ... Simply it is the matter of understanding but they don't have a number of vocabularies to express their ideas in written form, so most of the teachers dominantly use Dawrogna language in the classroom. Actually teachers also prefer Dawro Doona for different reasons. At this level the teacher doesn't have mandate to use Dawrogna, but instead if they face great difficulty and if they can't understand a content well, I use to some extent. I use Dawrogna.

Both interviewees claimed that they and other teachers use Dawro Doona because they state they see their students not understanding the lesson fully if L1 is completely avoided. Mr. Darota further explained how comfortable the students become when their L1 is used in the classroom and how much that supports students learning saying:

... they are very happy when some concepts are expressed in their first language. You can see this from their face. They also feel confident to ask questions when they don't understand. If you use only English, you see students with dark face may be struggling to understand the lesson, but they don't ask questions, even they don't answer your questions if you don't allow them to use their first language.

From Mr. Darota's clam t can be learned that L1 use increases classroom participation rate of students, helps teachers know how much the students understand the lesson and make the classroom more convenient to students. Mr Darota believed that students generally benefit from L1 use, but how much they benefit depends on the students' learning ability. He claimed that high achievers gain more benefit from code-switching as it increases their understanding on the lesson. The slow learners are also benefited because L1 use minimally helps them understand the lesson content.

… it depends on students themselves. For some students especially for high and middle achievers, when you use Dawrotsuwa words for the terms they may not easily understand if not said in their mother tongue, that accelerates their learning. In turn that helps them achieve better. But for shy and slow learners, that may encourage them to expect everything in Dawrootsuwa. But still at least they understand the lesson when their first language is used.

Mr. Barata also shared the same view, but pointed that too much use of L1 should be warned.

From my experience, students perform better when their first language is used in the classroom because they understand the content of the lesson very well when their mother tongue is used. But overuse of the mother tongue makes the classroom Dawro Doona class. So the extent of mother tongue the teacher uses should be noted.

Concerning the effects of code-switching on students writing performance Interviewee 2 claimed that code-switching could help students for free writing tasks that for controlled ones.

I think it (code-switching) helps for all, but it may help more for free writing because for controlled writing the words or expressions they supply are more limited, but during free writing, if the students are allowed to gather as much information as possible from the teacher and their peer students and if they ask English words they don't know, I think they can write better.

However, interviewee 1 said that he was not sure for what kind of writing tasks the students benefit most, but he claimed that students generally benefit from CS.

Code-switching basically helps students in speaking. But I think it can help in all skills because when students feel free to think and ask, I think they can write better. Whether they benefit from controlled or guided writing needs some research. Now I can generally say that they benefit from it, but I'm not sure on which they benefit better.

Interviewee 2 thought that students could benefit more from CS at sentence level writing. "I think they benefit in sentence writing. Essay writing needs more independent work, but to write paragraph and sentences they can simply gather sufficient information from the classroom discussion."

The perceived opinions of teachers are matching to the results obtained from the experiment because students generally benefit from code-switching. However, what interviewee 2 believed that students would benefit more at sentence level writing than essay was found untrue because from the analysis of the posttest results it was found that students benefited more at essay writing.

3.11.10 Summary of Findings

The present findings provide empirical support for the strategic use of code-switching as a pedagogical tool in L2 writing instruction. The results demonstrate that integrating learners' L1 within the instructional process can significantly enhance writing performance across various linguistic and structural dimensions. While some outcomes did not achieve statistical significance, the overall trends and observed effect sizes indicate that code-switching may be a valuable instructional practice in multilingual educational contexts.

The substantial improvements were observed in sentence-level writing. Students in the experimental group who received instruction incorporating code-switching outperformed their counterparts in grammatical accuracy and syntactic control. These results suggest that the strategic use of L1 can reduce cognitive load, facilitate greater comprehension of grammatical structures, and support learners in developing foundational writing competencies. This aligns with existing literature that emphasizes the cognitive benefits of translanguaging in scaffolding L2 acquisition.

Although the differences in paragraph structure between the two groups did not reach statistical significance, the presence of a moderate effect size indicates that code-switching may exert a positive influence on learners' ability to organize and structure written content. The findings suggest that code-switching can assist learners in managing the complexity of text organization, particularly when transitioning from sentence-level control to extended discourse. These preliminary results warrant further investigation with larger sample sizes and extended instructional periods.

The findings also indicate that code-switching contributes positively to students' ability to develop and support ideas in essay writing. Students in the experimental group produced texts

characterized by greater coherence, logical progression, and depth of analysis. It appears that code-switching facilitates access to cognitive and conceptual resources that enable learners to formulate and articulate more complex arguments in the L2. This supports the notion that the first language serves not merely as a fallback but as a productive cognitive tool for academic reasoning in second language contexts.

The analysis further reveals that code-switching enhances the explicitness and communicative clarity of student writing. Essays produced by students in the experimental group were more transparent in purpose, better structured, and more accessible to readers. These findings underscore the pedagogical value of code-switching in contexts where precision and clarity are essential components of academic writing. The use of L1 appears to assist learners in expressing abstract and complex ideas more effectively in L2.

When considered holistically, students in the code-switching group demonstrated consistent gains across all assessed levels of writing—sentence, paragraph, and full essay. Although the most pronounced improvements occurred at the sentence level, positive effects were also observed in higher-order writing tasks, indicating that the benefits of code-switching extend beyond surface-level language support. These results affirm the comprehensive pedagogical potential of incorporating code-switching in L2 writing instruction.

An analysis of individual writing features—namely language accuracy, structural organization, idea development, and explicitness—revealed that the code-switching group consistently outperformed the English-only group. These findings provide robust evidence that code-switching supports not only linguistic proficiency but also the rhetorical and organizational aspects of academic writing. The multidimensional nature of these gains strengthens the argument for using L1 strategically to support the development of complex writing skills in L2 contexts.

It is noteworthy that some teacher perceptions regarding the utility of code-switching were not fully aligned with the empirical findings. While one interviewee anticipated greater benefits at the sentence level than at the essay level, the post-test results indicated otherwise. In fact, students exhibited greater gains in essay-level performance, suggesting that code-switching may

be particularly effective in supporting extended written discourse. This highlights the need for ongoing professional development and evidence-based pedagogical decision-making.

Despite the encouraging outcomes, certain limitations must be acknowledged. The lack of statistical significance in some areas, combined with the relatively short duration of the intervention and limited sample size, restricts the generalizability of the findings. Future studies employing larger, more diverse populations and longitudinal designs are necessary to confirm and expand upon the current results. Such research would offer a clearer understanding of the long-term impact of code-switching on L2 writing proficiency.

In conclusion, the study provides substantial evidence that code-switching, when employed strategically, can enhance various dimensions of L2 writing performance. From sentence-level grammar to essay-level coherence and argumentation, learners benefit from the cognitive and linguistic support afforded by the integration of L1. Although further research is warranted, the current findings support the pedagogical value of code-switching in second language writing classrooms, particularly in multilingual educational settings where learners may face significant linguistic and cognitive challenges.

3.11.11 Lessons learned from the pilot study

The pilot study was conducted with weekend program students during the summer term. This period coincided with the region’s rainy season, a time characterized by adverse weather conditions and rising river levels, which significantly disrupted transportation and accessibility. As most participants were commuting from their homes to the university on a weekly basis, attendance was adversely affected. Several students were unable to return to campus for scheduled sessions, resulting in incomplete data sets, particularly regarding the post-tests. This posed challenges to both the internal validity and completeness of the study.

Furthermore, instructional consistency was compromised due to the instructor's absence in certain sessions, caused both by weather-related challenges and personal circumstances. Consequently, the instructor had insufficient time to implement the full sequence of planned writing tasks. This limitation likely affected the depth and variety of writing practice, thereby

influencing students' exposure to and engagement with the pedagogical interventions under investigation.

Additionally, the method of analyzing data across disaggregated tables led to unnecessary fragmentation of findings. This approach hindered the ability to observe patterns holistically and may have obscured broader insights into students' performance across writing levels and features. A more integrated and cohesive data presentation framework is necessary for the main study to enable clearer interpretation and comparison of results.

Collectively, these challenges have yielded important lessons for the design and implementation of the main study. In particular, it has become evident that conducting the main research with regular program students—who are more likely to attend classes consistently and are less affected by seasonal environmental disruptions—would enhance the reliability and robustness of the findings. This adjustment is expected to facilitate more structured instruction, consistent assessment, and comprehensive data collection, thereby supporting a more valid evaluation of the pedagogical effects of code-switching on L2 writing performance.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This chapter presents and analyzes the results obtained from three key sources of data: the pretest, posttest, and semi-structured interviews. The pretest results are discussed first to establish the initial level of writing proficiency among participants and to verify the equivalency of the control and experimental groups prior to the implementation of the instructional intervention. This step was essential to ensure that any observed differences in performance after the intervention can be attributed to the treatment rather than pre-existing disparities between the groups.

Following this, the chapter details the posttest results, which are used to assess the impact of the instructional intervention on students' writing performance. The analysis of posttest outcomes directly addresses research objectives one through seven, each of which pertains to various aspects of students' writing development. By comparing the performance of the experimental group (which received instruction incorporating code-switching) with that of the control group (which received instruction in English only), the study evaluates the effectiveness of code-switching as a pedagogical strategy in enhancing students' writing performance.

In addition to the quantitative data, this chapter also presents the findings from the semi-structured interviews conducted with English language instructors. These qualitative insights complement the statistical findings by exploring teachers' perspectives on the use of the first language (Dawro Doona) in English language classrooms. The interview data provide valuable contextual understanding of the rationale behind code-switching practices, perceived benefits and drawbacks, and the specific challenges faced during implementation. This component of the analysis is designed to address the eighth research objective which focuses on the pedagogical implications of L1 use in writing instruction from the instructors' point of view.

Together, these results form a comprehensive picture of how classroom code-switching influences writing development among learners, and how teachers perceive and navigate its use in the language learning process.

4.1 The Pretest Results

Since the present study employed a quasi-experimental research design, the participants were divided into two distinct groups: a control group and an experimental group. In order to ensure a balanced and objective distribution of participants, a pretest was administered prior to the intervention. The total scores obtained from this pretest were used as the basis for group assignment, allowing for a relatively equivalent level of initial writing proficiency across both groups. This approach was intended to minimize pre-existing differences and enhance the internal validity of the study.

Table 4.1: The pretest results between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	p	d
English only	17	12.76	3.85	0.93						
					0.02	0.89	-0.08	31	0.93	0.03
Code switching	16	12.88	3.71	0.93						

A total of thirty-three students participated in the study. Of these, seventeen were assigned to the English-only group (Section One), which served as the control group and received instruction exclusively in English. The remaining sixteen students were allocated to the code-switching group (Section Two), the experimental group, which received instruction that systematically incorporated code-switching strategies.

Descriptive statistics for the pretest scores are presented in Table 1. The English-only group achieved a mean score (M) of 12.76 with a standard deviation (SD) of 3.85, while the code-switching group obtained a slightly higher mean score of 12.88 (SD = 3.71). The standard error of the mean (SEM) was equal in both groups at .93, indicating a comparable degree of variation within each group.

To examine whether the observed difference in mean scores between the groups was statistically significant, an independent samples t-test was performed. Prior to the t-test, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was conducted to assess the assumption of homogeneity of variances. The result, $F(1, 31) = .02$, $p = .89$, indicated that this assumption was met. The subsequent t-test

revealed no statistically significant difference between the two groups' pretest scores, t(31) = -0.08, p = .93. Furthermore, the calculated effect size (Cohen's d = .03) was negligible, suggesting minimal practical difference between the groups.

These results affirm that the two groups were statistically equivalent at the outset of the study in terms of their writing performance. This equivalence is essential for ensuring the internal validity of the study, as it supports the attribution of any subsequent differences in posttest outcomes to the instructional intervention rather than to pre-existing differences in writing ability.

4.2 The Results of Main Experiment

This section presents the posttest findings along with a detailed analysis of the results. Given the primarily quantitative nature of the dataset, statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS to ensure methodological rigor and precision in interpreting the outcomes. The data are systematically organized in alignment with the research questions and objectives outlined in the study.

The analysis is structured sequentially, addressing Objectives One through Seven. It focuses on assessing improvements in students' writing performance across different levels—sentence, paragraph, and essay—as well as in specific writing features such as organization, structure, grammar, and clarity. Special attention is given to identifying areas in which participants demonstrated the most significant gains.

Moreover, the comparative impact of the two instructional approaches—English-only instruction (control group) and code-switching instruction (experimental group)—on overall writing proficiency is critically examined. Each writing level and feature is analyzed in detail to provide a nuanced and comprehensive understanding of how the interventions influenced learners' academic writing development.

4.2.1 Comparison of students' grammatical accuracy in posttest writing

This section presents a detailed comparison of students' grammatical accuracy in posttest writing tasks between the English-only group and the code-switching group. The analysis is structured

across three levels of writing proficiency—sentence, paragraph, and essay—and directly addresses Objective One of the study, which investigates whether code-switching as a pedagogical intervention significantly enhances students' grammatical accuracy in English writing. Grammatical accuracy is defined here as the correct and consistent use of language forms, including verb tense, subject-verb agreement, word order, and punctuation. By examining group differences in mean scores, standard deviations, statistical significance (p-values), and effect sizes (Cohen's *d*), this section evaluates the extent to which the mode of instruction—English-only versus code-switching—impacts learners' grammatical control. The findings offer insights into whether incorporating students' first language through code-switching leads to measurable improvements in their English writing accuracy compared to exclusive English instruction.

Table 4.1: Comparison of students' writing performance of grammatical accuracy between groups

Feature of writing	Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	Sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed)	d
Language (at sentence level)	EO	17	1.79	0.68	0.17						
						0.46	0.50	-0.41	31	0.69	0.14
	CS	16	1.91	0.89	0.22						
Language (at Paragraph level)	EO	17	1.82	0.68	0.16						
						2.03	0.16	-0.23	31	0.82	0.08
	CS	16	1.89	0.96	0.24						
Language (at essay level)	EO	17	1.72	0.64	0.16						
						0.96	0.34	-0.29	31	0.78	-0.10
	CS	16	1.80	0.88	0.22						
Total average of performance on Language	EO	17	1.78	0.64	0.15						
						1.26	0.27	-0.32	31	0.76	0.11
	CS	16	1.86	0.90	0.23						

Table 4.2 summarizes the posttest comparison of students' grammatical accuracy in writing between the English-only group and the code-switching group. At the sentence level, the code-switching group achieved a slightly higher mean score (M = 1.91, SD = 0.89) than the English-only group (M = 1.79, SD = 0.68). However, an independent samples t-test revealed that this difference was not statistically significant, t(31) = -0.41, p = .69. The associated effect size (Cohen's d = 0.14) was minimal, indicating a negligible practical impact of instructional method on students' sentence-level grammatical performance.

At the paragraph level, a similar pattern emerged. The code-switching group again outperformed the English-only group by a small margin (M = 1.89, SD = 0.96 vs. M = 1.82, SD = 0.68), but the difference was statistically non-significant, t(31) = -0.23, p = .82. The effect size (Cohen's d = 0.08) remained very small, implying limited influence of instructional approach on students' ability to apply grammatical rules in more extended and structured writing.

At the essay level, the trend persisted with the code-switching group maintaining a slight advantage in grammatical accuracy (M = 1.80, SD = 0.88) compared to the English-only group (M = 1.72, SD = 0.64). Yet, this difference was also not statistically significant, t(31) = -0.29, p = .78, and the effect size (Cohen's d = -0.10) was effectively negligible.

When performance was aggregated across all three levels, the total average grammatical accuracy of the code-switching group (M = 1.86, SD = 0.90) remained slightly higher than that of the English-only group (M = 1.78, SD = 0.64). However, this cumulative difference did not reach statistical significance either, $t(31) = -0.31$, $p = .76$, with a small effect size ($d = 0.11$).

The findings of this study provide direct evidence in relation to Hypothesis 1. The null hypothesis (H_{01}), which states that code-switching has no statistically significant effect on the grammatical accuracy of students' English writing, is supported by the results. Although the code-switching group consistently showed marginally higher mean scores across all levels of writing, these differences were not statistically significant, and the associated effect sizes were uniformly small.

Accordingly, the alternative hypothesis (H_{11}), which posited that code-switching has a statistically significant effect on grammatical accuracy, is not supported by the data. The absence of statistically significant differences indicates that code-switching, as implemented in this study, did not produce a measurable impact on students' grammatical accuracy in English writing.

These results suggest that grammatical accuracy is likely influenced by a range of other factors beyond instructional language approach, such as learners' prior knowledge, individual differences, and the amount and quality of grammar practice. While code-switching may serve other pedagogical functions, its effect on grammatical accuracy, within the scope of this study, appears limited.

4.2.2 Comparison of students' structural coherence in posttest

This section presents a comparative analysis of students' posttest performance in writing coherence, a key component of effective academic writing. Coherence in this study is defined as the logical and orderly presentation of ideas through appropriate organizational structures at the sentence, paragraph, and essay levels. The analysis seeks to address objective Two: to determine whether the use of code-switching as an instructional strategy influences students' ability to construct coherent and well-structured written texts in English. Given that coherence reflects both linguistic competence and rhetorical control, examining differences in performance between students taught through English-only instruction and those taught using code-switching offers insights into the pedagogical implications of language use in bilingual classrooms. The subsequent sections present the findings by writing level, drawing on statistical comparisons to assess both the magnitude and significance of observed differences.

Table 4.1: Comparison of students' writing performance of structure between groups

Feature of writing	Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	Sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed)	d
Structure (at sentence level)	EO	17	1.79	.63	.15	.57	.46	.61	31	.55	0.21
	CS	16	1.64	.82	.20						
Structure (at Paragraph level)	EO	17	1.61	.73	.18	.001	.97	-.28	31	.78	0.10
	CS	16	1.69	.84	.21						
Structure (at essay level)	EO	17	1.31	.61	.15	1.95	.17	-1.00	31	.32	-0.35
	CS	16	1.55	.78	.20						
Total average of perfo-rmance on Structure	EO	17	1.57	.58	.14	1.24	.28	-.24	31	.82	0.08
	CS	16	1.63	.77	.19						

Table 4.3 summarizes the comparison of posttest writing performance on structural coherence between the English-only and code-switching groups. This analysis addresses one of the key research objectives: to determine whether code-switching, as an instructional approach, has a significant influence on students' ability to structure their writing clearly and logically at the sentence, paragraph, and essay levels.

At the sentence level, students in the English-only group recorded a slightly higher mean score (M = 1.79, SD = 0.63) compared to their counterparts in the code-switching group (M = 1.64, SD = 0.82). However, this difference did not reach statistical significance, $t(31) = 0.61$, $p = .55$. The effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.21$) was small, suggesting a limited practical impact of instructional method on coherence at the sentence level.

At the paragraph level, the trend reversed slightly, with the code-switching group performing marginally better (M = 1.69, SD = 0.84) than the English-only group (M = 1.61, SD = 0.73). Yet, this difference was also not statistically significant, $t(31) = -0.28$, $p = .78$, and the effect size was negligible ($d = 0.10$). These results imply that the instructional language had little influence on students' ability to structure ideas coherently within a paragraph.

More notably, at the essay level, the code-switching group demonstrated relatively stronger performance (M = 1.55, SD = 0.78) compared to the English-only group (M = 1.31, SD = 0.61). Although the difference suggested a moderate practical effect ($d = -0.35$), it remained statistically non-significant, $t(31) = -1.00$, $p = .33$. This finding hints at the potential of code-switching to support coherence in more extended writing, but the evidence remains inconclusive due to lack of statistical significance.

When examining the overall average scores for coherence across all writing levels, the code-switching group again held a slight advantage (M = 1.63, SD = 0.77) over the English-only group (M = 1.57, SD = 0.58). Nonetheless, this difference did not yield statistical significance, $t(31) = -0.24$, $p = .82$, and the corresponding effect size ($d = 0.08$) was very small.

The findings of this study offer clear support for Hypothesis 2. The null hypothesis (H_{02}), which states that there is no statistically significant difference in the coherence and cohesion of English texts produced by students exposed to code-switching and those taught using an English-only approach, is supported by the results. Although the code-switching group obtained marginally higher scores at the paragraph and essay levels—most notably at the essay level where a moderate effect size was observed—these differences were not statistically significant and therefore do not indicate a meaningful effect. The alternative hypothesis (H_{12}), which proposed that students exposed to code-switching would produce significantly more coherent and cohesive

texts than those taught using an English-only approach, is not supported by the data. The absence of statistically significant differences suggests that code-switching instruction, as implemented in this study, did not lead to measurable improvements in structural coherence and cohesion in students' writing.

These results indicate that coherence and cohesion in writing are likely influenced by multiple factors beyond the instructional language approach. While code-switching may show some observable variation in performance, such differences are not sufficient to establish a reliable or consistent impact within the parameters of this study.

4.2.3 Comparison of students' posttest performance in idea development and organizational skills

This section presents a comparative analysis of students' posttest performance in idea development and organizational skills—a fundamental component of academic writing proficiency. Idea development encompasses the ability to generate, elaborate on, and logically structure content in a way that ensures clarity and coherence, particularly in extended writing tasks such as paragraphs and essays. The analysis directly addresses Objective Three of the study, which investigates whether code-switching as an instructional approach significantly enhances students' capacity to develop and organize their written ideas. Through both descriptive and inferential statistical methods, the analysis explores how different instructional languages may influence students' writing organization and depth of content. The results, presented in Table 4.4, compare the posttest scores of students in the English-only and code-switching groups at both the paragraph and essay levels, offering insights into the pedagogical implications of language use in writing instruction.

Table 4.1: Comparison of students' writing performance of Idea Development between groups

Feature of writing	Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	Sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed)	d
Idea Development (at Paragraph level)	EO	17	1.53	.57	.14	3.85	.06	1.12	31	.27	0.39
	CS	16	1.33	.42	.11						
Idea Development (at essay level)	EO	17	1.22	.32	.08	.23	.63	.67	31	.51	0.24
	CS	16	1.16	.22	.06						
Total average of performance on Idea development	EO	17	1.38	.42	.10	1.79	.19	1.01	31	.32	0.36
	CS	16	1.24	.31	.08						

At the paragraph level, the English-only group recorded a higher mean score (M = 1.53, SD = 0.57) than the code-switching group (M = 1.33, SD = 0.42). Although this difference favored the English-only group, the independent samples t-test showed it was not statistically significant, t(31) = 1.12, p = .27. Nonetheless, the effect size was moderate (Cohen's d = 0.39), suggesting a small but potentially meaningful practical advantage for the English-only group in structuring ideas within paragraph-level writing.

At the essay level, a similar pattern was observed. The English-only group achieved a slightly higher mean score (M = 1.22, SD = 0.32) compared to the code-switching group (M = 1.16, SD = 0.22). The difference was statistically non-significant, t(31) = 0.67, p = .51, with a small effect size (d = 0.24), indicating minimal practical difference in students' ability to maintain coherence and develop ideas across longer texts.

When aggregating performance across both levels, the overall average idea development score was again slightly higher for the English-only group (M = 1.38, SD = 0.42) compared to the code-switching group (M = 1.24, SD = 0.31). However, this cumulative difference also did not reach statistical significance, t(31) = 1.01, p = .32, though the effect size remained in the small-to-moderate range (d = 0.36).

The study's results from the data clearly support Hypothesis 3. The null hypothesis (H03), which states that code-switching does not significantly enhance students' idea development and

organizational skills in English writing, is supported by the findings. Although the English-only group showed a consistent trend of higher mean scores across both paragraph and essay levels, these differences were not statistically significant, indicating that they do not represent a meaningful or reliable effect. The alternative hypothesis (H13), which proposed that code-switching significantly enhances students' idea development and organizational skills, is not supported by the data. The absence of statistically significant differences suggests that code-switching, as applied in this study, does not lead to measurable improvements in students' ability to generate and organize ideas in English writing.

While the observed pattern of slightly higher scores for the English-only group may suggest a modest practical tendency, it does not meet the threshold for statistical significance. At the same time, the results indicate that code-switching does not hinder students' organizational skills. Overall, these findings imply that instructional language alone is not a decisive factor in determining students' idea development and organizational performance in writing and other variables may play a more substantial role.

4.2.4 Comparison of students' posttest performance in Explicitness

In academic writing, explicitness—the clarity with which ideas are communicated—is essential for ensuring coherence, logical progression, and reader comprehension. It involves the precise articulation of concepts, the use of clearly defined goals, and the application of cohesive devices that guide the reader through the writer's argument. As such, explicitness is not only a marker of writing proficiency but also a reflection of the writer's ability to structure and communicate complex ideas in a coherent manner. This section addresses Objective Four of the study, which aimed to examine whether different instructional approaches—specifically English-only instruction versus code-switching—influenced students' ability to express their ideas with clarity and logical cohesion in academic writing.

Table 4.1: Comparison of students' writing performance of Explicitness between groups

Feature of writing	Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	Sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed)	d
Explicitness (at Paragraph level)	EO	17	1.43	.55	.13	1.06	.31	.91	31	.37	0.32
	CS	16	1.27	.46	.11						
Explicitness (at essay level)	EO	17	1.25	.42	.10	.05	.82	.04	31	.97	0.01
	CS	16	1.25	.31	.08						
Total average performance on Explicitness	EO	17	1.34	.46	.11	.34	.56	.57	31	.57	0.20
	CS	16	1.26	.36	.09						

Table 4.5 presents a comparative analysis of posttest performance in writing explicitness at both the paragraph and essay levels. The analysis explores whether students' clarity of expression varied meaningfully based on the language of instruction used during the intervention.

At the paragraph level, the English-only group achieved a slightly higher mean score (M = 1.43, SD = 0.55) compared to the code-switching group (M = 1.27, SD = 0.46). Levene's Test for Equality of Variances indicated that the assumption of homogeneity was met (F = 1.06, p = .31), validating the use of the t-test. However, the difference between the groups was not statistically significant, t(31) = 0.91, p = .37. The effect size (Cohen's d = 0.32) was small, indicating a minor practical advantage in favor of the English-only group, but not one that can be considered educationally substantial.

At the essay level, both groups exhibited nearly identical levels of explicitness. The English-only group had a mean score of 1.25 (SD = 0.42), while the code-switching group scored 1.25 (SD = 0.31), yielding no meaningful distinction. The t-test confirmed the lack of a significant difference, t(31) = 0.04, p = .97, and the effect size was negligible (d = 0.01), implying that instructional approach had virtually no effect on students' ability to communicate ideas clearly at this writing level.

When the scores were aggregated to assess overall average performance in explicitness across both paragraph and essay levels, the English-only group maintained a slight lead (M = 1.34, SD = 0.46) over the code-switching group (M = 1.26, SD = 0.36). Again, the difference was not

statistically significant, t(31) = 0.68, p = .57, and the effect size (d = 0.20) remained small, suggesting a limited practical impact.

Hypothesis 4 is clearly supported by the findings of the study. The null hypothesis (H_{04}), which states that code-switching does not significantly contribute to improved clarity in students' English writing, is supported by the results. Although the English-only group recorded marginally higher mean scores across both paragraph and essay levels, these differences were small, not statistically significant, and accompanied by trivial effect sizes. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H_{14}), which proposed that code-switching significantly contributes to improved clarity in students' writing, is not supported by the data. The absence of statistically significant differences indicates that code-switching, as implemented in this study, did not have a measurable impact on students' ability to express ideas clearly in written English.

Generally, the results suggest that clarity in writing is not meaningfully influenced by the instructional language approach. Both code-switching and English-only instruction appear to yield comparable outcomes in terms of students' explicitness in writing, indicating that other instructional or learner-related factors are more likely to play a decisive role in shaping clarity of expression.

4.2.5 Comparison of students' writing performance across features of writing between groups

This section presents a comparative analysis of students' posttest writing performance across four core features of academic writing: grammatical accuracy (language), structural coherence (structure), idea development**,** and explicitness (clarity). The comparison between the English-only and code-switching instructional groups is aimed at addressing Objective Five of the study, which seeks to identify the specific aspects of writing most influenced by the use of code-switching. Total average scores were analyzed alongside inferential statistical tests to evaluate whether either instructional approach conferred a measurable advantage in developing particular writing competencies. This analysis is further substantiated by results from ANOVA procedures (Tables 4.7 through 4.10), which offer a more comprehensive understanding of group differences across writing features. The data in ANOVA were analyzed using a combination of descriptive statistics, multivariate tests, within-subjects effects, and pairwise comparisons to provide a robust

interpretation of the results. The findings contribute to a more nuanced evaluation of code-switching's pedagogical effectiveness and its broader implications for instructional language choices in English writing education.

Table 4.1: Comparative analysis of students' posttest writing performance across four features of writing

Feature of writing	Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	Sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed)	d
Total average of performance on Language	EO	17	1.78	.64	.15						
						1.26	.27	-.32	31	.76	0.11
	CS	16	1.86	.90	.23						
Total average of performance on Structure	EO	17	1.57	.58	.14						
						1.24	.28	-.24	31	.82	0.08
	CS	16	1.63	.77	.19						
Total average of performance on Idea development	EO	17	1.38	.42	.10						
						1.79	.19	1.01	31	.32	0.36
	CS	16	1.24	.31	.08						
Total average performance on Explicitness	EO	17	1.34	.46	.11						
						.34	.56	.57	31	.57	0.20
	CS	16	1.26	.36	.09						

Table 4.6 presents a comparative analysis of students' posttest writing performance across four key features of writing—grammatical accuracy (language), structural coherence (structure), idea development, and explicitness (clarity)—between the English-only and code-switching instructional groups. For grammatical accuracy, the code-switching group achieved a slightly higher mean score (M = 1.86, SD = 0.90) compared to the English-only group (M = 1.78, SD = 0.64). However, the difference was not statistically significant, t(31) = -0.32, p = .76, with a very small effect size (Cohen's d = 0.11), indicating a negligible practical difference in language control between the two instructional methods.

In terms of structural coherence, the code-switching group again had a marginally higher mean (M = 1.63, SD = 0.77) than the English-only group (M = 1.57, SD = 0.58). The difference did not reach statistical significance, t(31) = -0.24, p = .82, and the effect size was minimal (d = 0.08), suggesting that instructional language had limited impact on students' ability to organize writing structurally.

In contrast, for idea development, the English-only group outperformed the code-switching group, with a higher mean score (M = 1.38, SD = 0.42) versus (M = 1.24, SD = 0.31). Although this difference was not statistically significant, t(31) = 1.01, p = .32, the effect size was small to moderate (d = 0.36), indicating a modest practical advantage for English-only instruction in developing and organizing ideas.

Finally, in the domain of explicitness, which reflects the clarity and cohesion of expressed ideas, the English-only group again recorded a slightly higher mean (M = 1.34, SD = 0.46) than the code-switching group (M = 1.26, SD = 0.36). The difference was not statistically significant, t(31) = 0.57, p = .57, with a small effect size (d = 0.20), suggesting limited instructional impact.

None of the differences between groups across the four features of writing reached statistical significance. However, small effect sizes suggest marginal practical advantages for the code-switching group in grammatical accuracy and structure, while the English-only group showed slightly stronger performance in idea development and explicitness. These findings indicate that the influence of code-switching is relatively uniform across features, with no single aspect showing a substantial or statistically significant advantage.

Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics of Writing Performance across Features of Writing

Descriptive Statistics				
	group of participants	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Total average of performance on Language	English only	1.78	0.64	17
	code switching	1.86	0.9	16
	Total	1.82	0.76	33
Total average of performance on Structure	English only	1.57	0.58	17
	code switching	1.63	0.77	16
	Total	1.6	0.67	33
Total average of performance on Idea development	English only	1.38	0.42	17
	code switching	1.24	0.31	16
	Total	1.31	0.37	33
Total average of performance on Explicitness	English only	1.34	0.46	17
	code switching	1.26	0.36	16
	Total	1.3	0.41	33

Table 4.7 presents the descriptive statistics for students' posttest writing performance across four core features of academic writing—grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea

development, and explicitness—categorized by instructional group. The data reveal that the code-switching group achieved a higher mean score in grammatical accuracy (M = 1.86, SD = 0.90) compared to the English-only group (M = 1.78, SD = 0.64), suggesting a modest advantage in managing linguistic correctness when instruction incorporated code-switching. A similar pattern emerged in the area of structural coherence, where the code-switching group again slightly outperformed the English-only group (M = 1.63 vs. M = 1.57), indicating a potential benefit in organizing ideas at the sentence or paragraph level under bilingual instructional support.

In contrast, the trend reverses for the features of idea development and explicitness, where the English-only group exhibited higher mean scores (Idea development: M = 1.38; Explicitness: M = 1.34) than the code-switching group (Idea development: M = 1.24; Explicitness: M = 1.26). These results suggest that while code-switching may enhance aspects related to linguistic and structural form, English-only instruction may be more effective in supporting students' ability to develop and clearly articulate ideas.

Overall, these descriptive findings highlight the differential impact of instructional language on various components of writing proficiency. They underscore the importance of conducting inferential statistical analyses to determine whether these observed differences are statistically significant and to better understand the instructional implications of using code-switching in the development of specific writing competencies.

Table 4.1: Multivariate Test Results across Features of Writing

Multivariate Tests[a]							
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Features	Pillai's Trace	0.53	10.75[b]	3.00	29.00	.00	.53
	Wilks' Lambda	0.47	10.75[b]	3.00	29.00	.00	.53
	Hotelling's Trace	1.11	10.75[b]	3.00	29.00	.00	.53
	Roy's Largest Root	1.11	10.75[b]	3.00	29.00	.00	.53
Features * group	Pillai's Trace	0.07	.76[b]	3.00	29.00	.53	.07
	Wilks' Lambda	0.93	.76[b]	3.00	29.00	.53	.07
	Hotelling's Trace	0.08	.76[b]	3.00	29.00	.53	.07
	Roy's Largest Root	0.08	.76[b]	3.00	29.00	.53	.07
a. Design: Intercept + group Within Subjects Design: Features							
b. Exact statistic							

To examine whether students' performance varied significantly across the four assessed features of writing—grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and explicitness—a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted. As presented in Table 4.8, the multivariate test for the main effect of writing features yielded a statistically significant result across all multivariate test criteria: Pillai's Trace = 0.53, Wilks' Lambda = 0.47, Hotelling's Trace = 1.11, and Roy's Largest Root = 1.11, with a shared F-value of $F(3, 29) = 10.75$, $p < .001$, and a partial eta squared (η^2) = 0.53. These results suggest that students' writing performance significantly varied across the different writing features, indicating that not all areas of writing were equally developed or affected by the instructional context.

In contrast, the interaction effect between instructional group (English-only vs. code-switching) and writing feature was not statistically significant across any of the multivariate tests (Wilks' Lambda = 0.93, $F(3, 29) = 0.76$, $p = 0.53$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.07$). This finding indicates that while differences exist among the writing features themselves, the pattern of performance across these features did not differ significantly between the two instructional groups. In other words, both groups exhibited similar trends in strengths and weaknesses across the four writing dimensions, regardless of the instructional method used.

These findings suggest that although writing features differ in overall difficulty or mastery level for learners, the choice of instructional approach (code-switching vs. English-only) did not systematically influence how students performed across these features. Further within-subjects analysis is warranted to explore the nature and extent of these differences in greater detail.

Table 4.1: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects across Features of Writing

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects							
Measure: MEASURE_1							
Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Features	Sphericity Assumed	6.22	3	2.07	26.32	.00	.46
	Greenhouse-Geisser	6.22	1.46	4.27	26.32	.00	.46
	Huynh-Feldt	6.22	1.56	3.98	26.32	.00	.46
	Lower-bound	6.22	1.00	6.22	26.32	.00	.46
Features * group	Sphericity Assumed	.27	3	.09	1.15	.34	.04
	Greenhouse-Geisser	.27	1.45	.19	1.15	.31	.04
	Huynh-Feldt	.27	1.56	.17	1.15	.32	.04
	Lower-bound	.27	1.00	.27	1.15	.29	.04
Error(Features)	Sphericity Assumed	7.32	93	.08			
	Greenhouse-Geisser	7.32	45.17	.16			
	Huynh-Feldt	7.32	48.36	.15			
	Lower-bound	7.32	31.00	.24			

Table 4.9 presents the results of the within-subjects analysis, which examined two primary effects: the main effect of writing feature and the interaction effect between writing feature and instructional group. The main effect of writing feature was statistically significant across all corrections for violations of the sphericity assumption—namely, Sphericity Assumed ($F = 26.32$, $p < .001$), Greenhouse-Geisser, Huynh-Feldt, and Lower-Bound corrections—with a partial eta squared (η^2) of 0.46. This indicates a robust effect size, suggesting that students' performance differed substantially across the four assessed features: grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and explicitness. These findings corroborate the earlier multivariate results and confirm that certain features of writing posed greater challenges or were more successfully demonstrated by students than others, regardless of instructional group.

In contrast, the interaction effect between writing feature and instructional group did not reach statistical significance ($F = 1.15$, $p = .34$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.04$). This result suggests that the variation in students' writing performance across the four features was not moderated by the type of instructional approach—whether English-only or code-switching. In other words, both instructional groups displayed similar patterns of relative strength and weakness across the writing features, and no single feature demonstrated a disproportionately greater benefit from the code-switching method.

Together, these results reinforce the conclusion that while writing features differ significantly in terms of student performance, the instructional language approach did not interact with feature type to yield differentiated effects. This supports the broader interpretation that code-switching, as implemented in this study, does not selectively enhance performance in any one specific aspect of academic writing more than others.

Table 4.1: Pairwise Comparisons of Writing Features

Pairwise Comparisons						
Measure: MEASURE_1						
(I) Features	(J) Features	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.[b]	95% Confidence Interval for Difference[b]	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	.22*	.06	.01	.05	.40
	3	.51*	.09	.00	.25	.78
	4	.52*	.09	.00	.26	.78
2	1	-.22*	.06	.01	-.40	-.05
	3	.29*	.06	.00	.11	.47
	4	.30*	.06	.00	.14	.46
3	1	-.51*	.09	.00	-.78	-.25
	2	-.29*	.06	.00	-.47	-.11
	4	.01	.02	1.00	-.05	.07
4	1	-.52*	.09	.00	-.78	-.26
	2	-.30*	.06	.00	-.46	-.14
	3	-.01	.02	1.00	-.07	.05
Based on estimated marginal means						
*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.						
b. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.						

To further investigate the nature of the differences among the four assessed writing features, pairwise comparisons were conducted using the Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparisons. As shown in Table 4.10, several statistically significant differences emerged:

- Language vs. Idea Development: Students performed significantly better on language (grammatical accuracy) than on idea development, with a mean difference of 0.51 ($p < .001$).
- Language vs. Explicitness: A similarly significant difference was observed between language and explicitness (clarity), with a mean difference of 0.52 ($p < .001$).
- Structure vs. Idea Development: Students also outperformed in structural coherence compared to idea development, with a mean difference of 0.29 ($p < .001$).

- Structure vs. Explicitness: Structural coherence scores were significantly higher than explicitness scores, with a mean difference of 0.30 ($p < .001$).

These results indicate that students demonstrated stronger performance in the formal and organizational aspects of writing (language and structure) than in content-related aspects (idea development and clarity). This pattern may reflect instructional emphases, student familiarity with surface-level writing mechanics, or broader challenges associated with higher-order writing skills like conceptual elaboration and communicative precision.

In contrast, no significant difference was found between idea development and explicitness ($p = 1.000$), suggesting that these two features posed a similar level of difficulty or received comparable instructional focus. This finding implies that students struggled equally with developing ideas and articulating them clearly, which may signal a need for targeted pedagogical strategies aimed at improving coherence, depth of content, and rhetorical clarity in writing.

Overall, these pairwise comparisons provide nuanced insight into the relative strengths and weaknesses in students' writing performance, highlighting distinct areas where instructional interventions—whether in English-only or code-switching formats—could be more precisely directed.

The combined results provide evidence in relation to Hypothesis 5. The null hypothesis (H_{05}), which states that code-switching does not have a statistically significant differential impact across grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity in students' English writing, is supported by the findings. Although variations in performance were observed across the different writing features, these differences were not statistically significant and did not indicate a consistent or measurable differential effect attributable to the instructional language approach.

Thus, the alternative hypothesis (H_{15}), which posited that code-switching would have a statistically significant differential impact across at least one of the writing dimensions, is not supported by the data. The results suggest that code-switching, as implemented in this study, does not exert a distinct or feature-specific influence on any of the evaluated aspects of writing when compared to English-only instruction.

While students demonstrated variation in performance across writing features—such as relatively stronger outcomes in language and structural components compared to other areas—these patterns appear to be independent of the instructional language used. This indicates that factors other than code-switching or English-only instruction are more likely to account for differences across writing dimensions, reinforcing the conclusion that instructional language alone does not differentially shape performance across grammatical accuracy, coherence, idea development, and clarity.

4.2.6 Comparison of students' writing performance across levels of writing between groups

This section presents a comparative analysis of students' writing performance at three levels of written production—sentence, paragraph, and essay—between the English-only and code-switching instructional groups. The analysis is designed to address Objective Six of the study, which aims to determine the specific level of writing at which students benefit most from the use of code-switching. By evaluating the total average scores at each level, this section explores whether one instructional approach consistently yields stronger writing outcomes across varying degrees of rhetorical and linguistic complexity. This analysis is further complemented by an ANOVA test to identify any significant performance differences and to pinpoint the level at which code-switching instruction may be most effective. The findings offer valuable insight into how instructional language shapes students' ability to produce grammatically accurate, coherent, and well-structured writing across multiple writing tasks.

Table 4.1: Comparison of average student performance across three levels of writing

Feature of writing	Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	Sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed)	d
Total average performance on Sentence writing	EO	17	1.79	.64	.16	.54	.47	-.02	31	.98	0.01
	CS	16	1.80	.85	.21						
Total average performance on Paragraph writing	EO	17	1.62	.61	.15	.00	.99	.13	31	.90	0.04
	CS	16	1.59	.68	.17						
Total average performance on essay writing	EO	17	1.38	.45	.11	1.89	.18	-.45	31	.65	0.16
	CS	16	1.46	.54	.14						

To provide a holistic understanding of how instructional approach influences overall writing ability, Table 4.11 presents a comparative analysis of total average student performance across three levels of writing—sentence, paragraph, and essay—between the English-only and code-switching groups. This analysis allows for an integrated perspective on whether language of instruction has a cumulative effect on students' writing proficiency across different structural complexities of written discourse.

At the sentence level, the English-only group (N = 17) had a mean score of M = 1.79 (SD = 0.64), while the code-switching group (N = 16) recorded a very similar mean of M = 1.80 (SD = 0.85). Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was not significant (F = 0.54, p = .47), indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met. An independent samples t-test confirmed no statistically significant difference between the groups, t(31) = -0.02, p = .98. The calculated effect size (Cohen's d = 0.01) was negligible, suggesting that the instructional language had virtually no practical impact on sentence-level writing performance. These results imply a comparable level of grammatical and structural competence in sentence construction among students in both instructional contexts.

At the paragraph level, the English-only group obtained a slightly higher mean (M = 1.62, SD = 0.61) than the code-switching group (M = 1.59, SD = 0.68). The difference in group variances was negligible (F = 0.00, p = .99), and the t-test again yielded no significant difference, t(31) = 0.13, p = .90. The effect size (d = 0.04) was minimal, indicating a very small practical difference. These findings suggest that the use of code-switching did not meaningfully affect students' ability to develop ideas and organize them effectively at the paragraph level.

At the essay level, the trend slightly favored the code-switching group, which recorded a higher mean score (M = 1.46, SD = 0.54) compared to the English-only group (M = 1.38, SD = 0.45). Although the variance difference approached significance (F = 1.89, p = .18), it did not violate the assumption of equal variances. The t-test showed that the difference in group means was not statistically significant, t(31) = -0.45, p = .65. The effect size (d = 0.16) was still small, suggesting a modest but inconclusive advantage for code-switching in extended writing tasks such as essays.

The comparative data across all three levels of writing reveal no statistically significant differences in writing performance between students taught through English-only instruction and those taught using code-switching. The consistency of small effect sizes across sentence (d = 0.01), paragraph (d = 0.04), and essay (d = 0.16) levels suggests that instructional language alone did not exert a meaningful influence on students' holistic writing performance**.**

These findings carry important pedagogical implications. They suggest that educators may adopt either instructional approach—English-only or code-switching—without fear of significantly compromising students' general writing proficiency. The lack of significant differences also indicates that other instructional variables may have a more pronounced impact on developing students' writing skills than language medium alone. Moreover, the slightly higher performance of the code-switching group at the essay level may warrant further investigation into whether strategic use of L1 supports higher-order writing tasks that demand cognitive complexity and elaboration.

The following tables (Tables 4.12 through 4.15) also present a structured statistical analysis examining participants' writing performance across three hierarchical levels of textual organization: the Sentence, Paragraph, and Essay levels. These levels represent increasing degrees of rhetorical and linguistic complexity, thus offering a gradient perspective on writing proficiency. The aim of this analysis is twofold: first, to determine whether there are statistically significant differences in performance across these three levels of writing, and second, to investigate whether these differences vary based on language use — specifically, between participants who attended English only class and those who were in code-switching class. Table 4.12 provides descriptive statistics illustrating the mean scores and standard deviations for each writing level by group. Table 4.13 presents the results of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), testing the overall effect of writing level and the interaction between writing level and language group. Table 4.14 includes results from a repeated measures ANOVA, allowing for the examination of within-subjects differences across the sentence, paragraph, and essay levels. Finally, Table 4.15 offers pairwise comparisons to pinpoint where statistically significant differences lie between the three levels. Collectively, these tables aim to elucidate how writing proficiency manifests across structural levels and whether code-switching influences performance patterns.

Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics of Writing Performance across Levels of Writing

Writing Level	Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Sentence	English Only	1.79	0.64	17
	Code Switching	1.80	0.85	16
	Total	1.80	0.74	33
Paragraph	English Only	1.62	0.61	17
	Code Switching	1.59	0.68	16
	Total	1.60	0.64	33
Essay	English Only	1.38	0.45	17
	Code Switching	1.46	0.54	16
	Total	1.42	0.49	33

Table 4.12 provides the descriptive statistics for writing performance across different writing levels—sentence, paragraph, and essay—while distinguishing between the English-only and code-switching groups. The mean values indicate that, across both groups, writing proficiency tends to decline as the task increases in complexity. At the sentence level, performance is relatively strong, with the English-only group scoring an average of 1.79 (SD = 0.64) and the code-switching group scoring an almost identical 1.80 (SD = 0.85). This near-parity suggests that at the most fundamental level of writing, the mode of linguistic processing (English-only vs. code-switching) has little to no impact on performance.

A similar trend is observed at the paragraph level, where the English-only group has a mean score of 1.62 (SD = 0.61), and the code-switching group has a comparable mean score of 1.59 (SD = 0.68). The slight decrease from sentence-level performance indicates an increasing cognitive demand as students are required to maintain coherence and cohesion across multiple sentences. Despite this, the differences between the two groups remain minimal, implying that linguistic approach does not substantially influence paragraph-level writing performance.

At the essay level, a small divergence between the groups emerges, with the English-only group scoring an average of 1.38 (SD = 0.45), while the code-switching group achieves a slightly higher mean of 1.46 (SD = 0.54). Although the difference is not substantial, it may suggest that code-switching could provide some cognitive or expressive advantages in more extended writing tasks. Nevertheless, given the overall decreasing trend in writing performance across levels, the data suggest that the complexity of the writing task is the predominant factor influencing student performance rather than the linguistic approach used.

Table 4.1: Multivariate Test Results across Levels of Writing

Effect	Test	Value	F	df Hypothesis	df Error	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Writing Level	Pillai's Trace	0.49	14.37	2	30	.00	0.49
	Wilks' Lambda	0.51	14.37	2	30	.00	0.49
	Hotelling's Trace	0.96	14.37	2	30	.00	0.49
	Roy's Largest Root	0.96	14.37	2	30	.00	0.49
Writing Level * Group	Pillai's Trace	0.04	0.55	2	30	.59	0.04
	Wilks' Lambda	0.97	0.55	2	30	.59	0.04
	Hotelling's Trace	0.04	0.55	2	30	.59	0.04
	Roy's Largest Root	0.04	0.55	2	30	.59	0.04

Table 4.13 presents the results of multivariate analyses examining the impact of writing level on performance and whether the interaction between writing level and linguistic group is statistically significant. The findings indicate a highly significant main effect of writing level across all four multivariate tests, with Pillai's Trace, Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace, and Roy's Largest Root all yielding an F-value of 14.37 ($p = .000$) and a partial eta squared of 0.49. These results strongly suggest that differences in writing level account for a substantial proportion of the variance in students' writing performance. The partial eta squared value of 0.49 indicates a large effect size, meaning that nearly 49% of the observed variance in writing scores is attributable to differences in writing task complexity.

On the other hand, the interaction effect between writing level and linguistic group was found to be non-significant across all tests ($F = 0.55$, $p = .59$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$). This indicates that the relationship between writing level and performance does not significantly vary between the English-only and code-switching groups. The negligible effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.04$) suggests that linguistic approach plays only a minor role, if any, in influencing students' writing scores across different levels. This finding reinforces the idea that writing proficiency is primarily constrained by the inherent cognitive and structural challenges of writing at increasing levels of complexity rather than by whether students are engaging in code-switching.

Table 4.1: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects across Levels of Writing

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Writing Level	2.37	2	1.19	21.15	.00	0.41
Writing Level * Group	0.05	2	0.02	0.44	.65	0.01
Error (Writing Level)	3.48	62	0.06			

Table 4.14 delves deeper into the impact of writing level on performance through an analysis of within-subjects effects. The results reveal a highly significant main effect of writing level, with an F-value of 21.15 ($p = .00$) and a partial eta squared of 0.41. This confirms that writing level has a substantial impact on student performance, accounting for approximately 40.6% of the variance. The strength of this effect highlights the increasing cognitive demands placed on students as they progress from sentence construction to paragraph development and, ultimately, to essay writing. These findings align with established theories of writing development, which suggest that as writing tasks become more complex, they require greater cognitive resources related to planning, organization, syntax, and coherence.

Conversely, the interaction effect between writing level and group remains non-significant ($F = 0.44$, $p = .65$, $\eta^2 = 0.01$), further supporting the notion that code-switching does not substantially impact writing performance across different levels. The effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.01$) is extremely small, suggesting that any differences between the English-only and code-switching groups are likely due to random variation rather than a systematic influence of linguistic approach. The error term for writing level ($SS = 3.48$, $df = 62$, $MS = 0.06$) suggests that individual differences in writing ability exist, but they are not significantly linked to whether students are allowed to code-switch.

Table 4.1: Pairwise Comparisons of Writing Levels

Writing Level (I)	Writing Level (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Sentence	Paragraph	0.20*	0.04	.00
Sentence	Essay	0.38*	0.07	.00
Paragraph	Sentence	-0.20*	0.04	.00
Paragraph	Essay	0.18*	0.06	.01
Essay	Sentence	-0.38*	0.07	.00
Essay	Paragraph	-0.18*	0.06	.01

Note: The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

Table 4.15 presents the results of pairwise comparisons between writing levels, adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni correction. The findings indicate that all comparisons between writing levels are statistically significant, further reinforcing the conclusion that writing performance declines as task complexity increases. Specifically, sentence-level performance was significantly higher than paragraph-level performance (Mean Difference = 0.18, p = .00) and essay-level performance (Mean Difference = 0.38, p = .00). This suggests that students find it relatively easier to construct individual sentences but struggle to maintain the same level of proficiency when required to connect sentences into paragraphs and develop ideas into full essays.

Similarly, paragraph-level performance was significantly higher than essay-level performance (Mean Difference = 0.18, p = .01), indicating that the transition from paragraph writing to essay writing introduces additional cognitive and structural challenges. These results highlight the critical need for targeted instructional support in helping students bridge the gaps between different levels of writing complexity. Given that these significant differences were observed across both groups, it is evident that writing level, rather than linguistic approach, is the primary determinant of performance.

The significance of these pairwise comparisons suggests that instructional strategies should prioritize scaffolding techniques to support students' writing development. Educators might consider implementing interventions that focus on improving students' ability to organize and expand their ideas across paragraphs and essays, as these areas present the greatest challenges. Additionally, while code-switching does not appear to negatively or positively affect writing performance in a statistically significant way, future research might explore whether it plays a more nuanced role in facilitating idea generation or reducing cognitive load in certain linguistic contexts.

The findings across Tables 4.13 through 4.16 provide evidence in relation to Hypothesis 6. The null hypothesis (H_{06}), which states that there is no statistically significant difference in the effect of code-switching across sentence-level, paragraph-level, and essay-level writing, is supported by the results. Although students' scores declined significantly as task complexity increased from sentence to paragraph to essay level, these variations reflect differences in writing level

rather than differences attributable to the instructional language approach. The alternative hypothesis (H_{16}), which proposes that code-switching has a statistically significant effect that varies across writing levels, with students benefiting more at one level than the others, is not supported by the data. The findings indicate that code-switching does not exert a differential or level-specific effect on writing performance across the assessed stages.

The results suggest that writing performance is more strongly associated with the inherent demands of the writing task than with the use of code-switching or English-only instruction. The consistent decline in scores across levels highlights the increasing cognitive and organizational complexity required at higher levels of writing, underscoring the importance of instructional strategies that progressively develop students' ability to produce coherent and well-structured texts, regardless of the instructional language approach.

4.2.7 The comparison of the students' overall performance in writing

This section presents a comparative analysis of students' overall posttest writing performance based on instructional approach—English-only versus code-switching. It directly addresses Objective Seven of the study, which aims to determine which instructional method leads to higher student achievement in English writing tasks. Drawing on descriptive statistics and inferential testing as presented in Table 4.16, the analysis evaluates differences in mean performance, variability, and statistical significance between the two groups. By examining aggregated posttest scores, this section offers a comprehensive perspective on how instructional language influences students' overall writing proficiency. The findings provide valuable insights into the relative effectiveness of code-switching compared to English-only instruction in supporting students' development as academic writers.

Table 4.1: Comparison of the Students' Overall Performance in Writing between groups

	group	N	Mean	SD	SE Mean	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	d
Total average performance on posttest	EO	17	1.60	.54	.13						
						.58	.45	-.09	31	.93	.03
	CS	16	1.61	.68	.17						

Table 4.16 presents the comparative analysis of the overall posttest writing performance between two groups of participants. The table includes statistical descriptors and inferential test results that collectively indicate whether there is a significant difference in writing performance between the two instructional methods.

The English-only group (n = 17) obtained a mean score of 1.60 on the posttest, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.54, indicating moderate variability in scores. The standard error of the mean (SE Mean) was 0.13, reflecting the precision of the sample mean estimate. In comparison, the code-switching group (n = 16) recorded a slightly higher mean score of 1.61, with a larger standard deviation of 0.68 and a standard error of 0.17. The greater SD and SE suggest a wider dispersion of scores and slightly less precision in the mean estimate for this group.

To assess whether the observed difference in mean scores was statistically significant, an independent samples t-test was conducted. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variances yielded an F-value of 0.58 and a corresponding significance level (Sig.) of 0.45, indicating that the assumption of equal variances between the two groups was met ($p > 0.05$).

The subsequent t-test result revealed a t-value of -0.09 with 31 degrees of freedom, and a two-tailed significance level of 0.93. This p-value is substantially higher than the conventional alpha level of 0.05, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in the overall writing performance between the English-only and code-switching groups.

The effect size, reported as Cohen's d = 0.03, is negligible, further confirming that the practical difference in performance between the two groups is minimal.

The statistical findings presented in Table 16 provide clear evidence in relation to Hypothesis 7. The null hypothesis (H_{07}), which states that there is no statistically significant difference in students' English writing performance between those taught using a code-switching instructional approach and those taught using an English-only approach, is supported by the results. Both groups achieved comparable posttest outcomes, with only marginal differences in mean scores and an effect size indicating a trivial impact. This suggests that the instructional language approach, whether code-switching or English-only, did not constitute a determining factor in students' overall writing performance. The alternative hypothesis (H_{17}), which proposed that

students taught using a code-switching instructional approach would demonstrate significantly higher English writing performance than those taught using an English-only approach, is not supported by the data. The absence of statistically significant differences indicates that code-switching, as implemented in this study, did not lead to measurable gains in overall writing achievement.

These findings suggest that writing performance is influenced by multiple factors beyond the instructional language approach. The results further indicate that both code-switching and English-only instruction can produce comparable outcomes when applied effectively, implying that neither approach is inherently superior in isolation. Instead, the effectiveness of instruction appears to depend more on pedagogical quality, learner characteristics, and task design than on the choice of language medium.

4.3 Teachers' Perception on Role of Code-Switching on Students' Language Learning

This analysis examines English language teachers' perspectives on the use of code-switching in the instruction of Dawro Doona-majoring students. It specifically addresses Objective Eight, which seeks to explore teacher perceptions regarding the role of code-switching in students' English language development. Drawing on the interview responses of Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 2, several key themes emerged, including the rationale for employing code-switching, its influence on student comfort and confidence, its perceived effect on academic performance, and its pedagogical function in writing instruction. The findings reflect a shared understanding of code-switching as a deliberate, context-sensitive instructional strategy that supports learners' comprehension and engagement by bridging linguistic and cultural gaps. This perspective highlights the practical and adaptive role of CS in multilingual classrooms, particularly when teaching complex language skills such as writing.

Both teachers affirmed the frequent use of code-switching as part of their instructional practice. Interviewee 1 explained, *"Yes, I do switch to Dawro Doona sometimes. I usually do this when students seem confused or when I introduce a difficult concept."* Similarly, Interviewee 2 noted, *"Yes, I frequently switch between English and Dawro Doona in my classes, especially when*

introducing new vocabulary, abstract concepts, or complex grammar structures." These statements underscore the idea that code-switching is not employed randomly but rather serves as scaffolding tool that aids comprehension and ensures classroom inclusivity. In particular, Interviewee 2 emphasized that CS also serves an affective function: *"It helps create a supportive environment where they feel secure and ready to learn."* This reflects a broader pedagogical awareness of the students' sociolinguistic backgrounds, wherein CS bridges the gap between unfamiliar English content and the familiar linguistic framework of Dawro Doona.

Another significant theme that emerged is the role of code-switching in enhancing student comfort and participation. Both teachers observed that learners feel more at ease when code-switching is permitted. Interviewee 1 stated, *"They are definitely more comfortable when I use code-switching. It reduces their fear of making mistakes and encourages them to participate more actively."* Likewise, Interviewee 2 remarked that, *"Students are significantly more comfortable when I use code-switching. They tend to respond more actively, ask questions, and participate in discussions when they know they can use their first language when necessary."* These responses highlight how CS can lower the affective filter (Krashen, 1982), fostering a learning environment where students are more willing to take risks, engage with the material, and interact with the teacher and their peers.

Regarding academic performance and achievement, both interviewees associated code-switching with improved student outcomes, particularly during the initial stages of language learning. Interviewee 1 stated that, "CS helps more, especially at the beginner and intermediate levels," while also noting that "EO might be more useful at advanced stages, but CS is a great scaffold for building understanding." Similarly, Interviewee 2 observed, "When students can draw on their L1, they are better able to understand the instructions, process the information, and express their ideas." These responses indicate that code-switching is perceived not merely as a linguistic convenience but as a supportive tool that can facilitate comprehension and assist learners in engaging with new content.

This perspective aligns with broader theoretical views, such as translanguaging, which emphasize the dynamic use of multiple languages to support meaning-making and cognitive development. However, these qualitative perceptions are not reflected in the quantitative findings

of the study, as no statistically significant difference was observed between the code-switching and English-only groups. This suggests that while teachers may perceive code-switching as beneficial for supporting understanding, such perceptions do not necessarily correspond to measurable differences in academic performance outcomes.

A particularly rich area of discussion emerged around the use of code-switching in writing instruction. Both interviewees emphasized that students benefit most from CS at the paragraph level. Interviewee 1 explained, "Students benefit the most at the paragraph level. They often struggle with connecting ideas or organizing their thoughts, and using their L1 as a reference helps them structure paragraphs more clearly." Interviewee 2 added, "Organizing a coherent paragraph—linking sentences with logic and flow—is more challenging. When allowed to brainstorm or outline their ideas in Dawro Doona first, they produce better-organized and more meaningful paragraphs." These observations highlight the cognitive demands associated with paragraph-level writing, where learners are required to generate, organize, and sequence ideas effectively.

In this context, code-switching is viewed as supporting the planning and idea-generation stages, enabling students to initially formulate their thoughts in their first language before expressing them in English. This perspective aligns with Cummins' (2000) Common Underlying Proficiency model, which suggests that conceptual knowledge and thinking skills developed in one language can transfer to another when appropriately supported.

However, the quantitative findings present a slightly different pattern, indicating that students showed the most notable (though not statistically significant) variation at the essay level rather than at the paragraph level. This suggests that while teachers perceive paragraph-level benefits from code-switching, its observable impact does not align clearly with these perceptions, and any differences across writing levels remain limited in magnitude and not statistically meaningful.

In conclusion, the interview findings reveal that English language teachers view code-switching as a flexible, context-dependent pedagogical strategy that supports comprehension, reduces learner anxiety, and facilitates participation, particularly at lower proficiency levels. Teachers perceive its value in scaffolding complex language input and supporting writing development,

especially during the initial stages of idea generation and paragraph construction. These perceptions are consistent with theoretical perspectives that emphasize the role of learners' full linguistic repertoires in meaning-making and cognitive development. However, when considered alongside the quantitative results of the study, which show no statistically significant differences between code-switching and English-only groups across writing measures, it becomes evident that these perceived advantages do not translate into measurable differences in performance. This convergence of qualitative and quantitative evidence suggests that while code-switching may play a supportive and facilitative role in the classroom, writing achievement is not determined by instructional language choice alone. Instead, it is shaped by a combination of pedagogical practices, learner characteristics, and task demands, indicating that both instructional approaches can function effectively when applied within well-structured and responsive teaching environments.

4.4 The Comparison of the Findings of Main Study and the Pilot Study

There was variation in sample size between the pilot and the main study which can be attributed to differences in student enrollment patterns and the timing of data collection. The pilot study included 68 participants, while the main study involved 33 students. This discrepancy is primarily due to the fact that the pilot study was conducted with weekend program students, where enrollment tends to be higher compared to the regular program. Additionally, participant selection in both phases was based on students who were registered for the writing course during the data collection period. During the pilot phase, a larger number of students were enrolled in the weekend program offering of the course, which resulted in a higher sample size. In contrast, the main study was conducted with regular program students, where fewer students were registered for the same course at that time. Therefore, the difference in sample size reflects natural variations in program enrollment and course registration rather than deliberate sampling differences.

The comparison the results between the pilot study and the main study reveals a notable discrepancy in findings, particularly regarding the effectiveness of code-switching in enhancing students' writing performance. It is important to note at the outset that this variation may, in part, be attributed to differences in the study contexts. The pilot study was conducted with weekend

program students during the summer term, a period characterized by irregular attendance and environmental disruptions, whereas the main study was carried out with regular program students during the winter term, where attendance and instructional conditions were more stable. These contextual differences likely contributed to variations in the results observed across the two phases. While the pilot study suggested that code-switching had a generally positive impact—sometimes approaching or achieving statistical significance—the main study found no statistically significant differences between the code-switching and English-only groups across all writing dimensions. This divergence warrants careful consideration and can be explained by several methodological and contextual factors.

First, the pilot study results should be interpreted with caution due to its acknowledged limitations, particularly issues related to inconsistent attendance, incomplete data sets, and disruptions caused by external factors such as weather conditions. These challenges likely affected the internal validity of the pilot study, potentially inflating observed differences between groups. In contrast, the main study was conducted under more stable and controlled conditions, with improved consistency in instruction and data collection, which may have produced more reliable and balanced results.

Second, the smaller and less stable sample in the pilot study may have contributed to variability in outcomes. With fewer participants and incomplete post-test data, the results may have been more sensitive to individual differences, leading to stronger apparent effects of code-switching. The main study, although still limited in size, benefited from a more structured grouping and complete data, which likely reduced random variation and provided a more accurate estimate of the true effect—namely, that differences between instructional approaches were minimal and not statistically significant.

Third, differences in instructional implementation may have played a role. As noted in the pilot study, the instructor was unable to fully implement the planned sequence of writing tasks due to time constraints and absences. This may have resulted in uneven exposure to instructional strategies, potentially favoring the code-switching group in certain instances. In the main study, more consistent instructional delivery allowed for a fairer comparison between the two approaches, thereby reducing the likelihood of biased outcomes.

Fourth, the pilot study relied on fragmented data analysis across disaggregated tables, which may have emphasized isolated gains without adequately capturing overall performance trends. In contrast, the main study adopted a more integrated analytical approach, allowing for a holistic comparison across writing dimensions and levels. This more comprehensive analysis revealed that, despite minor variations, the overall differences between groups were not statistically meaningful.

Finally, it is also possible that the pilot study captured short-term or context-specific benefits of code-switching—particularly in areas such as learner confidence or initial comprehension—which were not sustained or strong enough to produce measurable differences in the main study. This aligns with the overall conclusion that code-switching may support the learning process without necessarily resulting in significant improvements in performance outcomes.

The discrepancy between the pilot and main study findings can be attributed to differences in research conditions, sample stability, instructional consistency, and analytical approaches. While the pilot study suggested promising effects of code-switching, the main study provides more robust evidence indicating that these effects are limited and not statistically significant. Together, the two phases of the research offer complementary insights: the pilot study highlights the potential of code-switching as a supportive instructional strategy, while the main study clarifies that its impact on measurable writing performance is not substantial when compared to English-only instruction.

4.5 The Connection among the Findings, the CRT Theory and the Policy

The findings of this study affirm that code-switching does not inherently disrupt, nor does it demonstrably enhance, English writing proficiency in a statistically significant way. Instead, its role appears to be supportive and context-dependent, with its effectiveness shaped more by pedagogical application than by the language medium itself. For students with varying levels of bilingual competence, both instructional approaches can support writing development when combined with appropriate teaching strategies.

From a policy standpoint, the study does not identify a statistically significant advantage for either code-switching or English-only instruction. Rather, it indicates that writing achievement is

shaped by multiple factors beyond language choice alone. However, in highly multilingual contexts with numerous first languages, an English-only approach may offer practical advantages in terms of consistency, scalability, and equitable access. At the same time, the findings support the value of adaptable and inclusive instructional practices that prioritize effective teaching and learning conditions, with limited and strategic use of code-switching where contextually appropriate.

The findings of this study can also be meaningfully interpreted through the lens of Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT), which underpins the theoretical framework. CRT emphasizes the importance of valuing students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds as a means of fostering engagement, confidence, and meaningful learning. In this study, the qualitative data strongly align with this perspective, as teachers consistently described code-switching as a strategy that enhances comprehension, reduces anxiety, and promotes active participation. These perceptions reflect key CRT principles, particularly the idea that acknowledging students' linguistic identities contributes to a more inclusive and supportive learning environment.

Specifically, teachers' use of code-switching to clarify complex concepts, scaffold learning, and create a sense of comfort supports CRT's emphasis on making instruction relevant and accessible to learners. By allowing students to draw on their L1, code-switching functions as a bridge between prior knowledge and new learning, which is particularly important in foreign language (FL) contexts where exposure to the target language is limited. In this regard, the findings reinforce the theoretical claim that integrating students' linguistic resources can enhance motivation and engagement, even if such integration does not directly translate into measurable performance gains.

However, the quantitative results present a more nuanced picture. While CRT suggests that incorporating learners' linguistic backgrounds can lead to improved academic outcomes, this study found no statistically significant differences between the code-switching and English-only groups across key writing dimensions. This indicates that, although code-switching aligns well with CRT in promoting a supportive and inclusive learning environment, its impact on measurable writing performance may be limited or indirect. In other words, code-switching may

contribute more to affective and cognitive processes—such as confidence, participation, and comprehension—than to observable gains in writing proficiency.

Furthermore, the findings suggest that writing performance is more strongly influenced by factors such as task complexity, instructional quality, and learners' prior proficiency than by the instructional language approach itself. This does not contradict CRT, but rather refines its application by indicating that culturally responsive practices like code-switching should be viewed as supportive pedagogical tools rather than as standalone determinants of academic success.

In the context of FL learning, where students may lack intrinsic motivation and authentic exposure to the target language, the role of code-switching as a culturally responsive strategy remains relevant. It helps bridge the gap between learners' existing linguistic knowledge and the demands of English writing tasks, thereby making learning more accessible and meaningful. At the same time, the absence of significant performance differences suggests that such strategies should be integrated alongside other effective instructional practices, rather than being relied upon as the primary driver of achievement.

The findings both support and extend the CRT framework. They affirm the value of code-switching in enhancing the learning environment and addressing learners' sociolinguistic realities, while also highlighting that improved writing outcomes depend on a broader interplay of pedagogical and learner-related factors.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This study set out to examine the impact of instructional language—specifically, English-only versus code-switching approaches—on bilingual students' performance in English writing tasks. Drawing on quantitative analyses of writing at sentence, paragraph, and essay levels, as well as qualitative insights from teacher interviews, the findings provide a nuanced understanding of how linguistic strategy interacts with core dimensions of writing, including grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity. Contrary to the assumptions that code-switching may undermine linguistic performance, the results reveal that bilingual students exposed to code-switching perform comparably to their peers taught exclusively in English across most writing features. In some instances, code-switching appears to offer subtle advantages, particularly in expressive flexibility and structural organization, though these differences are not statistically significant. This discussion explores these findings in depth, guided by the central research questions, and situates them within broader pedagogical, cognitive, and sociolinguistic frameworks.

1. How does code-switching affect the grammatical accuracy of students' English writing?

The results of this study indicate that there was no statistically significant difference in grammatical accuracy, as assessed through the "Language" component of the rubric, between the English-only and code-switching groups. Although the code-switching group obtained a slightly higher mean score, this difference was not significant, suggesting that the use of L1 in instruction neither hindered nor meaningfully improved grammatical control.

This finding is consistent with Bialystok's (2001) argument that bilingualism enhances metalinguistic awareness, allowing learners to reflect more consciously on language form and use. Similarly, Cummins (2000) highlights the interdependence of linguistic systems, arguing that skills developed in the first language can positively transfer to second language contexts, including grammar. In this sense, code-switching may serve as a cognitive scaffold that supports syntactic awareness rather than disrupts it.

Myers-Scotton (1993) further supports this interpretation by conceptualizing code-switching as a deliberate, rule-governed process involving syntactic structures from two languages. This

suggests that when students code-switch, they are not simply mixing languages randomly, but applying grammatical rules from both systems in a controlled way—possibly reinforcing their understanding of L2 grammar through contrastive practice.

However, some researchers caution against overestimating the benefits of code-switching for grammatical development. Ellis (2008) points out that inappropriate or uncontrolled switching may lead to interference and grammatical errors, particularly when students lack sufficient L2 proficiency. Yet, the present findings do not support such negative outcomes; the absence of significant errors in the code-switching group suggests that, within a guided instructional context, such risks can be mitigated.

Given that the findings reveal no statistically significant grammatical advantage, they call into question the justification for the effort and complexity involved in implementing L1-based instructional support. If code-switching does not lead to meaningful improvements in grammatical outcomes, its use in highly multilingual classrooms may be neither efficient nor scalable.

Accordingly, the implications suggest that educators in such contexts may be better served by adopting approaches that emphasize inclusivity and practicality. This includes prioritizing instructional strategies that do not rely on specific L1s, employing simplified L2 input alongside visual aids and universally accessible scaffolding techniques, and reserving code-switching for limited, context-specific instances where it can be applied equitably.

Although the use of L1 does not appear to be detrimental, its neutral effect—coupled with the practical challenges posed by extensive linguistic diversity—indicates that it should not occupy a central role in instructional design within highly multilingual classrooms. It is important to note, however, that this “neutral effect” should be interpreted as the absence of a statistically detectable effect under the conditions of this study, rather than conclusive evidence of the absence of any effect, particularly given the sample size and associated limitations in statistical power.

2. Do students exposed to code-switching during instruction produce more coherent and cohesive English texts than those taught using an English-only approach?

In evaluating textual coherence and cohesion—captured under the "Structure" domain—this study found no statistically significant difference between the code-switching and English-only instructional groups. Both sets of students displayed similar abilities to logically organize content, sequence ideas, and maintain paragraph unity, suggesting that bilingual instruction does not hinder the macro-structural quality of students' writing.

This result challenges deficit-based assumptions that code-switching disrupts discourse-level organization. Instead, it aligns with research suggesting that coherence and cohesion are more strongly influenced by explicit instruction in text structure and genre conventions than by the exclusive use of the target language. Graham and Harris (2021) describe writing as a multidimensional cognitive task, where higher-order processes such as planning and structuring are distinct from, and not necessarily dependent on, lower-level language control. Similarly, Kellogg (2020) highlights that organizing ideas and managing rhetorical flow are executive functions that can operate independently of linguistic proficiency.

The finding also resonates with Brooks-Lewis (2009) and Levine (2011), who report that students allowed to code-switch during the composing process tend to demonstrate greater fluency and continuity. By reducing the cognitive burden of lexical retrieval or syntactic formulation in L2, code-switching can help maintain the flow of thought, indirectly supporting cohesion and paragraph-level organization.

While Ellis (2008) and Poplack (1980) caution that poorly integrated code-switches may disrupt syntactic cohesion, particularly in sentence-level transitions, the absence of significant structural disruption in the present study suggests that such risks can be mitigated when code-switching is used judiciously and under teacher guidance. This further indicates that bilingual instruction—when pedagogically intentional—can preserve, and in some cases enhance, students' ability to construct organized, coherent texts.

The study indicates that code-switching neither supports nor hinders the development of textual coherence. In other words, the presence or absence of code-switching does not appear to

significantly influence learners' ability to organize and connect ideas effectively. This suggests that bilingual learners, when provided with appropriate instruction, are able to manage structural and organizational demands at a level comparable to their EO peers.

From this perspective, the findings lend cautious support to the continued use of L2 as the primary medium of instruction, particularly in areas related to coherence and academic writing. Since code-switching does not confer a statistically detectable advantage, emphasizing consistent exposure to and practice in L2 may represent a more straightforward and equitable approach, especially in linguistically diverse classrooms. However, this should be interpreted as the absence of a detectable effect under the conditions of this study, rather than definitive evidence that code-switching offers no benefit in all contexts.

3. To what extent does code-switching enhance students' idea development and organizational skills in English writing?

The analysis revealed no statistically significant difference between the code-switching and English-only groups in the domain of Idea Development. While the English-only group performed marginally better, the minimal difference suggests that code-switching does not inhibit students' ability to generate, elaborate, or organize ideas in writing. This finding calls for a nuanced interpretation, especially in light of research on bilingual cognition and writing development.

Although using only English may promote conceptual continuity by reducing the need to shift between linguistic systems, the slightly lower performance among the code-switching group might reflect the added cognitive demands of managing two languages during the writing process. As Kellogg (1996) notes, writing involves a complex interplay of planning, translating, and reviewing—demands that are magnified when operating in an L2.

Yet, the absence of a significant gap also underscores the potential cognitive affordances of code-switching. According to Vygotskian theory, language functions as a tool for thought, with inner speech—often conducted in the learner's first language—playing a critical role in complex reasoning. This view is supported by Cummins (2005) and Durgunoğlu (2002), who found that bilingual students permitted to use both languages during prewriting tasks often demonstrate

superior performance on cognitively demanding writing assignments. By allowing students to access their full linguistic repertoire, code-switching can deepen conceptual engagement, improve lexical access, and enhance strategic planning—all key contributors to idea development.

Similarly, Lee and Schallert (2008) found that bilingual learners who code-switched during writing demonstrated greater originality and topic elaboration than their monolingual counterparts, even if their grammar was less precise. These findings reinforce the notion that idea development should not be assessed solely by monolingual norms of linguistic accuracy, but also by rhetorical effectiveness and depth of thought.

Furthermore, Hyland (2003) emphasizes that L2 writers often struggle with limited vocabulary and idiomatic knowledge, which can constrain idea expression. In this context, code-switching can serve as a compensatory strategy, allowing students to bypass linguistic bottlenecks and sustain idea flow during composition.

The theoretical backdrop of contrastive rhetoric (Kaplan, 1966) also sheds light on how students' L1 rhetorical patterns can influence their L2 writing. Rather than viewing these patterns as sources of interference, they may provide alternative organizational strategies that, when supported by instruction, enhance rhetorical flexibility.

While the data did not reveal a statistically significant effect, the findings indicate that code-switching neither impedes nor clearly enhances idea development. It is important to interpret this as the absence of a statistically detectable effect under the conditions of this study, rather than conclusive evidence of no effect. Within this context, the results may suggest that an English-only approach offers a more consistent and streamlined environment for academic writing. Maintaining instruction and production in English can provide learners with sustained exposure, uninterrupted practice, and closer alignment with academic conventions. In this sense, while code-switching may serve a limited facilitative role, an English-only approach may be comparatively more advantageous for supporting the development of ideas in formal writing contexts.

4. Does code-switching contribute to improved clarity in students' English writing?

The analysis of Explicitness—used here as an indicator of communicative clarity—revealed no statistically significant difference between the code-switching and English-only groups. Both groups demonstrated a comparable ability to express their ideas clearly, using logical sequencing and effective transitions. This finding suggests that code-switching does not measurably introduce ambiguity or disrupt cohesion, nor does an English-only approach produce a distinct advantage in terms of clarity. Overall, communicative clarity appears to be independent of the instructional language approach, indicating that students can achieve similar levels of explicitness under both code-switching and English-only conditions.

This result aligns with Nation's (2003) assertion that strategic use of L1 can support clarity and comprehension, particularly when learners are navigating complex or unfamiliar content. While Nation emphasizes maximizing L2 input—especially in classroom routines and communicative tasks—he also recognizes that brief, purposeful use of L1 can prevent misunderstanding and maintain instructional flow. By extension, the use of code-switching during instruction may enhance students' grasp of writing expectations and rhetorical conventions, contributing to clearer expression in their L2 writing.

The finding also supports the broader pedagogical shift toward flexible bilingual practices that prioritize meaning-making over rigid language separation. As Cummins (2005) argues, bilingual instruction need not sacrifice clarity or cognitive demand; rather, it can deepen learning by allowing students to access both languages as resources. The students' comparable performance in clarity suggests that explicit instruction in writing conventions—rather than exclusive use of English—is the key factor in developing this skill.

The data indicate that code-switching does not compromise clarity in student writing; however, it also does not demonstrate a statistically significant advantage over an English-only approach. This should be understood as the absence of a statistically detectable effect under the conditions of this study, rather than definitive evidence of no effect. The findings therefore suggest that communicative effectiveness is a teachable and transferable skill that is not inherently dependent on the use of multiple languages in instruction. For multilingual classrooms, this underscores the importance of pedagogical approaches that prioritize clarity of thought, logical organization, and

effective expression. Such outcomes can be supported through instruction that focuses on writing skills and strategies, regardless of whether teaching is conducted exclusively in one language or incorporates code-switching.

5. How does the impact of code-switching vary across different aspects of writing—grammatical accuracy, structural coherence, idea development, and clarity—and in which area is its influence most significant?

While no statistically significant differences emerged across writing dimensions between the code-switching and English-only groups, the patterns observed suggest that code-switching does not have a consistent or clearly differentiated influence on specific writing sub-skills. In particular, the slight variation observed in the Language component indicates only a minimal difference between the groups, without providing clear evidence of a meaningful advantage of one instructional approach over the other in terms of grammatical accuracy and lexical use.

This finding aligns with research highlighting bilingualism's role in enhancing metalinguistic awareness, which supports learners in noticing and analyzing grammatical structures across languages (Bialystok, 2001; Cummins, 2000). The ability to contrast linguistic systems may offer cognitive scaffolding, particularly useful in mastering syntactic patterns and vocabulary in English writing.

Conversely, the EO group showed minor advantages in Idea Development and Explicitness. These areas often demand sustained conceptual elaboration and alignment with academic discourse conventions, which may be more readily fostered in environments emphasizing full immersion in the target language. This pattern reflects Kellogg's (1996, 2020) model of writing as a layered cognitive process, wherein higher-order skills—such as organization, clarity, and elaboration—rely heavily on practice within the rhetorical expectations of the L2.

Moreover, findings from Lee and Schallert (2008) support this interpretation: bilingual writers permitted to code-switch often demonstrate richer idea development, yet may experience trade-offs in accuracy and textual coherence. Similarly, Hyland (2003) notes that limited lexical and rhetorical range in L2 can constrain learners' ability to articulate complex ideas clearly, even if overall content is strong.

Taken together, these results suggest that code-switching does not demonstrate a clear, statistically significant advantage for grammatical development, nor does it appear to differ meaningfully from English-only instruction in supporting idea development and clarity. Rather than positioning these instructional strategies as mutually exclusive, educators may consider that both can be used within a broader pedagogical framework. In practice, this may involve the selective and context-dependent use of code-switching alongside sustained L2 exposure, with instructional emphasis placed on gradually developing learners' proficiency in organizing ideas and producing extended discourse in English.

6. At which writing level (sentence, paragraph, or essay) do students benefit most from the use of code-switching?

Although no statistically significant differences were observed, the slight variation at the essay level does not provide clear evidence of a consistent advantage for the code-switching group. This suggests that any observed differences may be limited in magnitude and not sufficient to indicate a meaningful effect of code-switching on performance as writing tasks increase in complexity. At the same time, the findings indicate that code-switching does not impede higher-order writing processes such as planning, argument development, or rhetorical structuring. These processes appear to be similarly supported under both code-switching and English-only conditions, particularly in extended texts where such skills are more prominently required.

This aligns with Kellogg's (1996) model of writing, which distinguishes between lower-level transcription tasks and higher-order cognitive functions like content generation, organization, and revision. Code-switching may reduce cognitive load by allowing students to conceptualize and plan in their stronger language, thus freeing cognitive resources for idea elaboration and structural coherence in L2 writing.

Further supporting this, Durgunoğlu (2002) and Cummins (2005) argue that bilingual learners benefit from using L1 during prewriting stages of complex tasks. This scaffolding enables them to engage more deeply with content and structure, particularly when composing argumentative or narrative essays that demand sustained reasoning.

At the sentence level, however, the benefits of code-switching may be less pronounced. Here, writing demands center on grammatical accuracy and syntactic correctness, areas often emphasized through controlled L2 practice (Ellis, 2020; Harmer, 2004). In such tasks, the potential for L1 interference may outweigh the strategic advantages of code-switching, especially for less proficient writers (Odlin, 1989).

Thus, the results do not provide clear statistical evidence that code-switching is most beneficial at the essay level, although the observed patterns do not indicate any disadvantage associated with its use. Writing level, rather than the language approach, emerged as the primary factor associated with differences in student performance, with task complexity exerting a more pronounced effect than the linguistic medium of instruction. This suggests that student outcomes in extended writing tasks are more closely linked to the demands of the task itself than to whether instruction incorporates code-switching or is conducted in English only.

7. Which instructional approach—code-switching or English-only—leads to higher student performance in English writing tasks?

The results of this study reveal no statistically significant difference in overall writing performance between students taught through code-switching and those instructed via an English-only approach.

This outcome aligns with translanguaging theory (García & Wei, 2014), which conceptualizes bilingual learners as users of an integrated linguistic system rather than as two separate language codes. From this perspective, students in both groups may have drawn upon their full linguistic repertoire—whether explicitly allowed or not—to process and complete cognitively demanding writing tasks. The lack of a performance gap indicates that the ability to make meaning in writing is not necessarily constrained by the language of instruction, but is instead shaped by broader cognitive, linguistic, and pedagogical variables.

Furthermore, these findings echo the position of Cummins (2005), who argues that bilingual instructional practices, when strategically implemented, do not hinder language development but instead support conceptual transfer and cognitive engagement. In contexts where students share a

common L1, such as in this study, code-switching can serve as a scaffold for understanding abstract content and organizing complex ideas, even if the final output is in English.

Overall, the data suggest that no statistically significant differences exist between code-switching (CS) and English-only (EO) approaches in shaping writing achievement. This indicates that factors other than strict language policy are likely more decisive in influencing student performance. Rather than adhering rigidly to either paradigm, educators may benefit from adopting flexible, learner-responsive approaches that account for the dynamic nature of bilingual meaning-making in academic writing. The findings also do not support longstanding assumptions that monolingual instruction is inherently superior, suggesting instead that both instructional approaches can be pedagogically viable when implemented effectively.

In multilingual contexts such as Ethiopia, where a large number of first languages are spoken, the absence of a statistically significant advantage for code-switching has practical implications for instructional design. Given the linguistic diversity, approaches that rely primarily on a common instructional language (L2) may provide a more consistent and scalable framework, as they minimize the challenges associated with accommodating multiple L1s while supporting equitable access for all learners. In this regard, the existing education and training policy that recommends English-only (EO) use in higher education classrooms appears to be a reasonable and defensible approach within such a context.

While the findings consistently indicate no statistically significant differences between code-switching and English-only instruction, this pattern should be interpreted in light of the study's relatively small sample size and the associated limitations in statistical power. Accordingly, the results are more appropriately understood as indicating the absence of a statistically detectable effect under these conditions, rather than definitive evidence of no effect. The possibility that small but pedagogically meaningful differences exist cannot therefore be entirely excluded. Future research employing larger sample sizes, longitudinal designs, and more sensitive statistical techniques may provide greater analytical precision and help to determine whether such effects become more evident under conditions of increased statistical power.

8. How do English language teachers perceive the impact of code-switching on students' writing performance?

Interview data with English language teachers offers a nuanced, practice-based understanding of code-switching in multilingual classrooms. Both Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 2 perceived CS as a pedagogically sound and student-responsive strategy, particularly valuable at lower proficiency levels. Teachers emphasized its usefulness in explaining complex grammatical structures, clarifying instructions, scaffolding new vocabulary, and creating an inclusive classroom atmosphere that reduces anxiety and builds learner confidence.

These perceptions align with the view that code-switching functions as a strategic instructional tool rather than a deficit-based practice. At the same time, the absence of statistically significant differences between code-switching and English-only groups in the quantitative findings suggests that such perceived classroom benefits do not necessarily translate into measurable advantages in writing performance. In this sense, the interview data complement the statistical results by highlighting how CS may support the learning process, even if it does not produce a distinct performance edge.

Teachers' emphasis on contextual and judicious use of CS also reflects the idea that it should not replace sustained engagement with the target language. Instead, their perspectives support a balanced instructional approach in which L2 exposure remains central, while CS is used selectively to support comprehension and participation where necessary. This is consistent with the broader implication that communicative clarity and writing development are not dependent on a single language approach, but rather on effective pedagogy and learner support.

These findings also resonate with Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain (2009), who highlight that L2 teachers often engage in code-switching not out of linguistic deficiency, but to manage classroom discourse effectively, promote comprehension, and adapt to learner needs. Similarly, Creese and Blackledge (2010) advocate for a "flexible bilingualism" that validates students' full linguistic repertoires rather than imposing artificial separations between languages.

The interview data suggest that teachers view code-switching as a flexible, context-dependent strategy that can support learning processes, particularly for lower-proficiency learners, without

necessarily producing measurable improvements in writing outcomes. This interpretation is consistent with the quantitative findings, which indicate no significant difference between instructional approaches, reinforcing the idea that both code-switching and English-only instruction can function effectively depending on how they are implemented.

Although teachers perceive code-switching as beneficial for second language learning in general and for writing development in particular, the findings indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in performance between the code-switching (CS) and English-only (EO) groups. This suggests that while code-switching may be valued as a supportive classroom practice, its effects are not reflected in measurable gains in writing outcomes.

Teachers also expressed the view that students would benefit most from code-switching at the paragraph level. However, the quantitative results do not substantiate this perception, as no significant advantage was observed at that level. Instead, a slight, non-significant difference emerged at the essay level, though this variation is not sufficient to indicate a meaningful or consistent effect. Overall, these patterns reinforce the conclusion that differences in writing performance are not strongly associated with the instructional language approach.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents the conclusions drawn based on the findings of the study, and the recommendations grounded in those conclusions.

6.1 Conclusion

Although the relatively small sample size is acknowledged as a limitation, the findings of the study nevertheless allow for the following conclusions to be drawn regarding the effect of code-switching in English writing instruction for bilingual learners:

1. Students in the code-switching (CS) group showed only marginal differences in performance in the Language component; however, these differences were not statistically significant. This indicates that there is no meaningful distinction between the code-switching and English-only groups in terms of grammatical accuracy and lexical control.
2. The use of code-switching does not result in statistically significant differences in students' ability to produce coherent and well-structured writing. Both groups demonstrated comparable performance in organizing ideas logically, indicating that structural competence is not meaningfully influenced by the instructional language approach.
3. Code-switching does not lead to statistically significant differences in students' ability to elaborate on ideas. The findings indicate comparable performance across groups, suggesting that any variation is not meaningful and may instead be influenced by factors such as individual cognitive load and language proficiency.
4. Students in both groups demonstrated similar levels of clarity in their writing, with no statistically significant differences observed. This indicates that clarity is not meaningfully affected by the instructional language approach and does not differ between code-switching and English-only conditions.
5. No statistically significant differences were observed in the impact of code-switching across writing components, including grammatical and lexical proficiency. Differences in other areas, such as structure and idea development, were similarly minimal and not statistically meaningful, highlighting the multidimensional nature of writing and the limited influence of instructional language on these outcomes.

6. The benefits of code-switching may become more apparent at higher levels of writing complexity, such as essay writing, where the ability to draw on multiple linguistic resources could support more nuanced thinking and expression. However, writing level—not language approach—emerged as the primary determinant of student performance, with complexity exerting a stronger effect than linguistic medium.
7. There is no statistically significant difference in overall English writing performance between students taught using a code-switching approach and those instructed in English-only. This indicates that both groups achieved comparable outcomes, suggesting that the instructional language approach does not have a meaningful impact on overall writing performance.
8. Teachers generally view code-switching as a useful, context-sensitive instructional tool, particularly for learners at foundational levels. At the same time, their support for a gradual transition toward English-only instruction reflects an understanding that sustained L2 exposure remains important for long-term language development, indicating a balanced and pragmatic approach to instructional practice.

In terms of its original contribution to knowledge, this study provides empirical evidence from a multilingual Ethiopian higher education context demonstrating that code-switching does not produce statistically significant gains in L2 writing performance across multiple dimensions and writing levels. By integrating quantitative and qualitative data, the study offers a nuanced understanding that distinguishes between the perceived pedagogical value of code-switching and its measurable impact on learning outcomes. In doing so, it contributes to the existing body of research by challenging assumptions of clear superiority for either instructional approach and by highlighting the importance of contextual, task-related, and instructional factors in shaping writing development. More specifically, the findings show that code-switching does not lead to statistically significant improvements in key areas such as grammatical accuracy, coherence, idea development, and clarity, thereby supporting a more cautious, evidence-based interpretation of its pedagogical role. At the same time, the study demonstrates that English-only and code-switching approaches can yield comparable learning outcomes when effectively implemented, suggesting that instructional effectiveness depends less on language choice and more on the quality of teaching, task design, and learner engagement.

The results further underscore the importance of task complexity as a primary determinant of writing performance, as variations across sentence, paragraph, and essay levels indicate that cognitive and structural demands exert a stronger influence than the instructional language approach. In addition, the study refines the application of Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) by showing that while code-switching may enhance learner comfort, confidence, and participation, these benefits are not necessarily reflected in measurable performance gains, thereby distinguishing between affective support and academic outcomes.

Within the Ethiopian context, the findings offer practical insights for multilingual education, suggesting that the use of a common instructional language such as English may be more feasible in settings characterized by extensive linguistic diversity, while also affirming that limited and strategic use of L1 does not disadvantage learners.

Methodologically, the study contributes by combining statistical analysis with teacher perspectives, providing a more comprehensive understanding of classroom practices and bridging the gap between perception and measurable outcomes. Overall, the study advances a neutral, evidence-based perspective, indicating that code-switching neither significantly enhances nor hinders L2 writing performance, and that its role should be understood as context-dependent and supportive rather than determinative.

6.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the conclusions of the study:

1. Since no statistically significant differences were found between code-switching and English-only instruction, educators should adopt flexible, context-sensitive approaches rather than relying exclusively on one method. Code-switching may be used selectively to support comprehension, particularly at lower proficiency levels, while maintaining consistent exposure to English.
2. In multilingual contexts, greater emphasis may be placed on English as a common instructional language to ensure consistency and equitable access for all learners. At the same time, limited and strategic use of students' L1s can be permitted where it is pedagogically justified.

3. Given the significant decline in performance from sentence to essay level, instructional efforts should focus on supporting students' development of higher-level writing skills. This includes explicit teaching of discourse organization, coherence, argument development, and the use of cohesive devices.
4. As relatively weaker performance was observed in idea development and structural aspects of writing, greater emphasis should be placed on helping students generate, elaborate, and organize ideas effectively, regardless of the instructional language approach.
5. Teacher education programs should include training on both English-only and code-switching approaches, emphasizing when and how each can be used effectively. This would enable teachers to make informed, context-dependent decisions rather than relying on fixed assumptions about either approach.
6. Since instructional language alone did not significantly influence outcomes, educators and researchers should give greater attention to other factors such as instructional quality, learner proficiency, feedback practices, and task design.
7. Future studies should explore how individual learner characteristics—such as prior proficiency, learning strategies, and cognitive factors—interact with instructional approaches, in order to better understand what drives writing development in multilingual contexts.

REFERENCES

Ajayi, L. (2006). Vernacular use in Nigerian schools: A consideration for English language teachers. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *19*(3), 303–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310608668771

Al-Adnani, A., Elyas, T. (2016). The Effect of Teacher's Code-Switching on Students' Achievement in Speaking in the EFL Context. Official Conference Proceedings: The International Academic Forum: www.iafor.org

Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Allen, J. R. (2015). The Effects of Explicit Code-Switching Instruction on Student Writing Performance for Students Who Speak Non-Standard Forms of English. Education Masters.Paper 315.

Alsamadani, H. (2010). "The Relationship between Saudi EFL Students' Writing Competence, LI Writing Proficiency, and Self-regulation". European Journal of Social Sciences 16 (1)

Alsamadani, H. A. (2010). The relationship between Saudi EFL students' writing competence, L1 writing proficiency, and self-regulation. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 16*(1), 53–63.

Amlaku E. (2013). Language Policies and the Role of English in Ethiopia: conference paper. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/publications 1259267200.

Andrade, H. (2000). Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning. *Educational Leadership*, *57*(5), 13–18.

Andrade, H., & Du, Y. (2007). Student responses to criteria-referenced self-assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *32*(2), 159–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930600801928

Applebee, A. N., & Langer, J. A. (2011). *Writing in the 21st century*. National Commission on Writing.

Auer, P. (1998). Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity. Routledge.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). *Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom*. TESOL Quarterly, 27(1), 9-32.

Bakhtiari, S. (2014). *The Impact of L1 Use on L2 Learning: A Case Study*. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5(4), 897-904.

Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. University of Wisconsin Press.

Bazerman, C., Applebee, A. N., Berninger, V., Brandt, D., Graham, S., Jeffery, J. V., & Shaughnessy, M. (2020). *Handbook of Writing Research*. Routledge.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The Psychology of Written Composition*. Routledge.

Berninger, V. W., Abbott, R. D., Augsburger, A., & García, A. (2010). *Relations among writing, reading, and writing-related cognitive processes in second and fourth-grade students. Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(4), 1031–1047. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020835

Bialystok, E. (2001). Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition. Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2020). *Chronotopes, Scales, and Complexity in the Study of Sociolinguistic Change*. Routledge.

Britton, J. (1975). *The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18)*. Macmillan.

Brock-Utne, B., & Alidou, H. (2006). Active students—Learning through a language they master. In H. Alidou et al. (Eds.), *Optimizing learning and education in Africa – the language factor* (pp. 96–129). ADEA/UNESCO.

Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *30*(2), 216–235. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn051

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. Pearson Education.

Burnett. R. and Kastman, L. (1997). Teaching Composition: Current Theories and Practices" In Phye, G. (Ed) (1997) Handbook of Academic Learning: Construction of Knowledge, San Diego: Academic Press

Canagarajah, A. S. (2020). *Translingual Practices and Neoliberal Policies*. Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). *Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging*. The Modern Language Journal, 95(3), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x

Cohen, A. D. (1994). *Assessing Language Ability in the Classroom* (2nd ed.). Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Cook, V. (2001). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(3), 402-423.

Crawford, J., & McLaren, P. (2001). *Critical pedagogy and language learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 103–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x

Cumming, A. (2001). Learning to write in a second language: Two decades of research. *International Journal of English Studies*, **1**(2), 1–23.

Cumming, A. (2014). *Assessing writing: A critical review of current approaches and tools*. Language Testing, 31(1), 3-32.

Cummins, J. (1979). *Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters*. Working Papers on Bilingualism, **19**, 121–129.

Cummins, J. (1981). *The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students*. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), **Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework** (pp. 3–49). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society* (2nd ed.). California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. (2005). Teaching for cross-language transfer in dual language education: Possibilities and pitfalls. *TESOL Symposium on Dual Language Education: Teaching and Learning Two Languages in the EFL Setting*, Istanbul, Turkey.

Cunningham, P. M., & Allington, R. L. (2011). *Classroom teaching strategies for promoting writing skills*. Pearson.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.

DeCosta, P. I., & Norton, B. (2017). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching, 50*(4), 501–516. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000285

Devitt, A. J. (2021). *Writing Genres*. Southern Illinois University Press.

Dornyei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition. USA: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Dougherty, B. (1985) Composing Choices for Writers: A Cross-Disciplinary Rhetoric, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company

Dougherty, J. (1985). *Writing: A Creative Process*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dubbaala Gabayyo. (1998). Dawurothuwa Tossaanne Misayuwa Haasaya Amaarathuwa Bilethaana. Waka.

Durgunoğlu, A. Y. (2002). Cross-linguistic transfer in literacy development and implications for language learners. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *52*(1), 189–204. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-002-0012-y

Elbow, P. (1973). *Writing Without Teachers*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2020). *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. Routledge.

Ellis, R., & Yuan, F. (2004). The effects of planning on fluency, complexity, and accuracy in second language narrative writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*(1), 59–84. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104261034

Emig, J. (1971). *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*. NCTE.

Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia.(1994). Education and Training Policy. St. George Printing Press, Addis Ababa

Ferguson, G. (2003). **Code-switching in the classroom: A pedagogical tool for bilingual students**. *Journal of Bilingual Education*, 18(3), 209-221.

Ferris, D. R. (2022). *Teaching L2 Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice*. Routledge.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2014). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2023). *Teaching ESL/EFL Writing: Principles and Techniques*. Routledge.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society. Mouton.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 365–387. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600

Fries, C. C. (1945). *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. University of Michigan Press.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Cenoz & D. Gorter (Eds.), *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging* (pp. 258–277). Cambridge University Press.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (Eds.). (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. Routledge.

García, O., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2017). Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. García, A. M. Y. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 117–130). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02258-1_9

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). **Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education**. Palgrave Macmillan.

Garza, T., & Nava, E. (2005). *The Role of Code-Switching in L2 Acquisition: A Case Study of Bilingual Learners*. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8(3), 187-205.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. Cambridge University Press.

Goh, C. (2014). *Second language listening: Presage, process, and pedagogy*. Cambridge University Press.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Routledge.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and Practice of Writing: An Applied Linguistic Perspective*. London: Longman.

Graham, S. (2021). *Writing and Writing Instruction: Theory and Evidence-Based Practices*. APA.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2005). *Writing better: Teaching writing strategies to students with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities,* 38(3), 227–249. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222194050380030601

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2021). Evidence-based practices in teaching writing. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 37*(3), 239–258.

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools*. Alliance for Excellent Education.

Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Chambers, A. (2020). *The effectiveness of writing instruction in the age of standardized testing*. Writing Research Quarterly, 31(3), 197-214.

Grosjean, F. (2001). The bilingual's language modes. In J. Nicol (Ed.), *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing* (pp. 1–22). Oxford: Blackwell.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M. (1989). Spoken and Written Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hamp-Lyons, L., & Condon, W. (2000). *Assessing the portfolio: Principles for practice, theory, and research*. Hampton Press.

Harbord, J. (1992). *The Use of L1 in the Classroom*. ELT Journal, 46(4), 350-355.

Harmer, J. (2001). The Practice of English Language Teaching (Third Edition), Harlow: Pearson Education Limited

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Pearson.

Harris, M., & McCann, P. (2021). *The analytic approach to writing assessment: Advantages and limitations*. Journal of Language Testing, 24(4), 403-420.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). *The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research,* 77(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 1–27). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Heaton, J. B. (1990). *Writing English Language Tests*. Longman.

Heugh, K. (2010). Productive engagement with linguistic diversity in tension with globalised discourses in Ethiopia, Current Issues in Language Planning, 11:4, 378-396: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2011.541867

Hickey, T. (2010). Second language writing and the transfer of skills. *Language and Education, 24*(2), 81–97.

Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction*. University of Michigan Press.

Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2007). Writing scholars as teacher-scholars: The struggle for academic legitimacy. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *The oral-literate connection: Perspectives on L2 speaking, writing, and other media interactions* (pp. 1–22). University of Michigan Press.

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 15*(3), 261–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.658016

Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging in today's classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *Theory Into Practice, 51*(4), 239–247. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.726051

Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 112–126. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000071

Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for Language Teachers* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and Second Language Writing*. University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2016). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2018). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2019). *Teaching and Researching Writing*. Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2021). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. K. (2022). *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*. Routledge.

Ivanič, R. (2022). *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. John Benjamins.

Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Newbury House.

Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), *On Translation*. Harvard University Press.

Janks, H. (2021). *Language and Power in Writing Pedagogy*. Routledge.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, **16**(1), 1–20.

Kellogg, R. T. (1996). A model of working memory in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 57–71). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kellogg, R. T. (2020). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 112*(4), 745–762.

Kenenisa Beressa. (2003). Using L1 in the EFL classroom: the case of the Oromo language with particular reference to Adama Teachers College. MA thesis submitted to the school of graduate studies of Addis Ababa University

Kenner, C. (2004). Becoming biliterate: Young children learning different writing systems. *Multilingual Matters*.

Kern, R. (1994). The role of the first language in second language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 311-328.

Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Kim, Y. (2005). "Current Trends in Writing Pedagogy: A Brief Overview." *Language Teaching, 38*(2), 115–125.

Knight, T. (1996). Learning vocabulary through shared speaking tasks. The Language Teacher 20, 1: 24-29.

Knoch, U., McNamara, T., & O'Loughlin, K. (2022). *Assessing writing: A review of analytic scoring systems*. Cambridge Handbook of Second Language Writing, 2(3), 17-38.

Kormos, J. (2021). *Language and writing: How assessment can influence language development*. Journal of Language Assessment, 9(2), 45-63.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.

Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. Routledge.

Kroll, B. (1991). "Teaching Writing in the ESL Context." *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Kroll, B. (2001). Considerations for teaching an ESL/EFL writing course. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (3rd ed., pp. 219–232). Heinle & Heinle.

Kunnan, A. J. (2000). Fairness and validation in language assessment. In A. J. Kunnan (Ed.), *Fairness and validation in language assessment* (pp. 1–15). Cambridge University Press.

Lameta-Tufuga, E. (1994). Using the Samoan language for academic learning tasks. *Bilingual Research Journal, 18*(1–2), 173–185.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2006). *New Literacies: Everyday Practices and Classroom Learning*. Open University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). Techniques and principles in language teaching (2nd Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Laufer, B., & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: A case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics*, *29*(4), 694–716.

Lee, J. (2010). The differential effects of code-switching in the Korean EFL context. *Language Awareness*, 19(1), 26-40.

Lee, J. H. (2010). The Differential Effects of Teacher Code - Switching on the Vocabulary Acquisition of Adult and Young EFL Learners: A Study in the Korean Context. Kellogg College (thesis).

Lee, J. H. (2012). Implications for language diversity in instruction in the context of target language classrooms: Development of a preliminary model of the effectiveness of teacher code-switching. English Teaching: Practice and Critique; Volume 11, Number 4

Lee, J. S. (2010). The false promise of instructional code-switching: A study of Korean English as a foreign language students. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*(1), 182–183. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp045

Lee, S., & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Constructing trust between teacher and students through feedback and revision in writing. *Written Communication*, *25*(4), 505–537. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088308322553

Levine, G. S. (2011). *Code choice in the language classroom*. Multilingual Matters.

Li Wei. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, **39**(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review, 4*(1), 195–218. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0009

Lin, T. B., & Hong, J. S. (2021). *Investigating holistic scoring: An analysis of inter-rater reliability*. TESOL Quarterly, 55(1), 147-170.

Macaro, E. (1997). Target Language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy; Modern Languages in Practice: 5. UK: Multilingual Matters

Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring "optimal" use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35–49). Multilingual Matters.

Macaro, E. (2014). Overview: Where should we be going with classroom code-switching research? *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 17*(1), 10–23.

MacArthur, C. A. (2010). *The need for collaboration in writing research and instruction. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice,* 25(2), 75–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5826.2010.00303.x

MacSwan, J. (2017). A multilingual perspective on translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1), 167–201. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216683935

Manchón, R. M. (Ed.). (2011). *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language*. John Benjamins.

Martin-Beltrán, M. (2010). Positioning proficiency: How students and teachers (de)construct language proficiency at school. *Linguistics and Education*, *21*(4), 257–281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2010.09.002

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Macmillan.

Milanovic, M. (2020). *Innovative approaches to writing assessment in TESOL*. TESOL Journal, 25(2), 57-73.

Mohanty, A. K. (2006). Multilingualism of the unequals and predicaments of education in India: Mother tongue or other tongue? In O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & M. E. Torres-Guzmán (Eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and globalization* (pp. 262–283). Multilingual Matters.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534

Muthusamy, P. (2009). Code-switching in Malaysia: Rule-governed or socially conditioned? *Multilingua*, *28*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.2009.001

Muysken, P. (2000). **Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing**. Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). **Duplex models of code-switching: The matrix language frame model**. *Theoretical Perspectives on Code-Switching*, 23-41.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nation, I. S. P. (2003). *The Role of First Language in Foreign Language Learning*. In *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 513-527). Blackwell Publishing.

Nation, I. S. P. (2019). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Nation, P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. Routledge.

Nigatu Habtamu. (2013). Exploring the use of L1 in the EFL classroom: the case of Hadiyyisa with particular reference to grade 5 in some selected primary schools of Hadiya Zone. Ma thesis submitted to the school of graduate studies of Addis Ababa University

Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). **Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis**. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 477-508.

Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Multilingual Matters.

Nunan, D. (1989). Designing Tasks for the Communicative C1assroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners: Practical Approaches for Teachers*. Addison-Wesley.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, *18*(7–8), 581–618. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581

Probyn, M. (2009). 'Smuggling the vernacular into the classroom': Conflicts and tensions in classroom code-switching in township/rural schools in South Africa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(2), 123–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802153137

Raimes, A. (1998). Exploring through writing: A process approach to ESL composition (2nd ed.). *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(1), 67–84.

Roscoe, R. D., & Chi, M. T. H. (2007). *Understanding tutor learning: Knowledge-building and knowledge-sharing in peer tutoring*. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(4), 534–574. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313408

Rost, M. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Listening*. New York: Routledge.

Rubagumya, C. M. (2003). English medium primary schools in Tanzania: A new linguistic market in education? In M. Makoni et al. (Eds.), *Language and institutions in Africa* (pp. 55–69). CASAS.

Salkind, N. J. (2008). Encyclopedia of educational psychology (Volume 1&2). USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Sankoff, D., & Poplack, S. (2019). **The social life of code-switching**. *Language in Society*, 48(2), 253-273.

Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2020). *The role of error correction in second language writing*. Journal of Second Language Writing, 49(1), 23-35.

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal, 11*(8). http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html

Shipka, J. (2021). *Toward a Composition Made Whole*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Shohamy, E. (2001). *The Power of Tests: A Critical Perspective on the Uses of Language Tests*. Pearson Education.

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, **27**(4), 657–677. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587400

Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. K. (2002). Writing as a second language. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On Second Language Writing* (pp. 1–12). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Simasiku, L., Kasanda, C., and Smit, T. (2015).Can Code Switching Enhance the Learning of the Target Language? Journal of Modern Education Review, ISSN 2155-7993, USA. June 2015, Volume 5, No. 6, pp. 564–575

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education—or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Snow, C. E. (2010). *Academic language and the challenge of reading for learning about science*. *Science*, 328(5977), 450–452. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1182597

Spice, A. (2018). *Code-Switching in the Classroom: A Tool for Language Learning*. Language Teaching Research, 22(2), 145-159.

Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2013). Pairing learners in pair work activity. *Language Teaching Research*, *17*(1), 31–48. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168812457530

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*(4), 760–769. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588224

Street, B. (2022). *Social Literacies: Critical Approaches to Literacy in Development, Ethnography, and Education*. Routledge.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of output in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 125-142.

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). Continuum.

Sweller, J. (1988). *Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning*. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/0364-0213(88)90023-7

Tardy, C. (2021). *Genre-Based Writing Instruction in Multilingual Settings*. University of Michigan Press.

Tariq, M. H., & Khan, M. A. (2019). **Code-switching in bilingual classrooms: A tool for learning and social cohesion**. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 177-191.

Tian, L., & Macaro, E. (2012). Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English-only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese university students: A lexical focus-on-form study. *Language Teaching Research*, *16*(3), 367–391. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168812436909

Tseng, W., & Liou, H. (2021). *The reliability and validity of analytic scoring rubrics*. Language Testing in Asia, 11(2), 89-112.

Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). **First language use in second language teaching**. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(4), 557-578.

Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(1), 6–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893270

Venuti, L. (1995). **The translator's invisibility: A history of translation**. Routledge.

Venuti, L. (1995). The translator's invisibility: A history of translation. Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics, 39*(1), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732997

Weigle, S. C. (2018). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Westwood, P. (2008). *What Teachers Need to Know About Teaching Methods*. Camberwell: ACER Press.

Wood, D. J., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17(2), 89–100. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x

Writing Development Centre. (2009). Features of academic writing. Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, United Kingdom.

Yinager, M. (2018). Investigating the attitude of students toward the use of Amharic in English-medium content subject classrooms. *TESOL Journal*, 9(1), 48-64

Yinager, T., Boersma, E. (2018). Attitudes towards Code-switching in an English-medium Content Classroom. PASAA Vol. 55

Zamel, V. (1982). *Writing: The process of discovering meaning*. TESOL Quarterly, 16(2), 195-209.

Zeleke Arficho. (2013). Training in the Learning Strategies of Writing: Its Effects on Students' Writing Skills. A PhD Thesis Submitted to the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Addis Ababa University

Zemach, D. and Rurnisek, L. (2005). Academic Writing: From Paragraph to Essay. Oxford: Macmillan York: Kluwer Academic Publishers Education

Zhang, X., & Kunnan, A. J. (2022). *Issues in large-scale writing assessments: Holistic vs. analytic scoring*. Language Testing, 39(3), 394-419.

Zheng, B., & Warschauer, M. (2022). Technology and writing: Enhancing student learning in the digital age. *Journal of Literacy Research, 54*(1), 23–42.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). *Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview*. *Theory into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2

LIST OF PUBLISHED ARTICLES

Article 1: Effect of L1 Use on Students' Essay Writing Performance (EWP) in English Language Classroom

ENGLISH EDUCATION JOURNAL
(EEJ)
Journal Homepage: https://jurnal.usk.ac.id/EEJ/

Effect of L1 Use on Students' Essay Writing Performance (EWP) in English Language Classroom

Markos Medhin Nuru Mohammed

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communication, Addis Ababa University,

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effects of first language (L1) use on students' EWP in an English language (L2) classroom. Utilizing an experimental design, data was collected through pretests, posttests, and interviews. The participants were second-year undergraduate students majoring in Dawro Doonaa and enrolled in a Sophomore English course. Originally, all sixty-eight students were in one section, divided into two sections for this study. To establish similar baseline levels, a pretest was administered, and students were grouped based on their scores. Their EWP was evaluated through a posttest, and interviews with two instructors provided insights into their views on L1 use in student's writing. The data analyzed with a t-test in SPSS version 26 showed that students who were allowed to use their L1 in the English classroom performed significantly better than those in an English-only setting. Thus, it is suggested that L2 teachers in bilingual environments should consider a strategic and optimal use of students' L1.

Keywords: *classroom language, essay writing, L1 use, writing performance.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Learning a second language (L2) is a complex process influenced by various factors, including the learner's first language (L1). In the context of English language learning, particularly essay writing, the role of L1 has been a subject of considerable interest and debate among educators and researchers. Understanding the effect of L1 use on students' EWP is crucial for developing effective teaching strategies and improving language proficiency.

Effective essay writing in English requires mastery of multiple linguistic and cognitive skills, such as grammar, vocabulary, coherence, cohesion, and critical thinking (Hyland, 2019). For L2

learners, these skills are often developed with reference to their L1, which serves as a cognitive and linguistic resource (Cumming, 2001). The interplay

Corresponding author, email: markofmedan@gmail.com

Citation: Medhin, M., & Mohammed, N. (2024). Effect of L1 use on students' Essay Writing Performance (EWP) in English Language Classroom. *English Education Journal, 15*(3), 183-194.

https://doi.org/10.24815/eej.v15i3.40748
Received 16 January 2024; Revised 3 March 2024; Accepted 12 July 2024
Available online 31 July 2024

between L1 and L2 can significantly impact learners' ability to produce well-structured and coherent essays in English.

Historically, language teaching methodologies have oscillated between strict monolingual approaches and more flexible bilingual strategies. Early methods, such as the Grammar-Translation Method, heavily relied on L1 for teaching L2, while later approaches, like the Direct Method and Communicative Language Teaching, emphasized exclusive use of L2 (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Despite these shifts, the use of L1 in L2 classrooms remains a contentious issue, with arguments both for and against its use.

Theoretical frameworks such as Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory suggest that L1 can play a facilitative role in L2 learning by providing cognitive and linguistic support (Vygotsky, 1978). This theory posits that social interaction and cultural tools, including language, are fundamental to cognitive development. In this light, the use of L1 in the classroom can be seen as a valuable resource that aids comprehension and learning. Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) further emphasizes the importance of guided interaction and scaffolding, where L1 can serve as a scaffold to bridge the gap between current abilities and potential development in L2 (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

Research has also indicated that the strategic use of L1 can reduce cognitive overload, allowing learners to focus more on the task at hand (Macaro, 2005). For instance, using L1 for brainstorming and planning can help students organize their thoughts more effectively before writing in L2 (Woodall, 2002). Moreover, L1 can be instrumental in clarifying complex grammatical structures and vocabulary, thereby enhancing comprehension and retention (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003).

This study aims to investigate the effect of L1 use on students' EWP in English language classrooms. Understanding this relationship is significant for several reasons. First, it can inform teaching practices and help educators make evidence-based decisions about the inclusion of L1 in their instruction. Additionally, it can contribute to the broader discourse on bilingual education and translanguaging, offering insights into how these approaches impact language development. Furthermore, this research has the potential to influence language education policies, advocating for practices that support effective language acquisition.

The relevance of this study extends to both theoretical and practical domains. Theoretically, it explores the intersections between L1 and L2, contributing to our understanding of bilingual cognition and language transfer (Odlin, 1989). Practically, it offers empirical evidence that can guide teachers in optimizing their instructional strategies to improve student outcomes in essay writing.

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How does the use of L1 affect the overall performance of students' essay writing in English?
2. What specific features of essay writing (e.g., language, structure, idea development, explicitness) are most influenced by L1 use?

Based on these questions, the study hypothesizes that:
1. Alternative Hypothesis 1: The use of L1 in English classroom affects the overall performance of students' essay writing.
2. Null Hypothesis 1: The use of L1 in English classroom does not have any effect on the overall performance of students' essay writing.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing has long been recognized as a crucial means of translating thoughts into language, allowing us to express our ideas and emotions. Dougherty (1985) emphasizes that writing is a deeply creative process, akin to producing a work of art. Writing's importance extends beyond creativity, as recent research highlights its cognitive benefits, particularly when done by hand. Studies suggest that handwriting enhances brain connectivity and memory retention, as it encourages reframing information in one's own words, leading to a deeper understanding (Mueller & Oppenheimer, 2014; Ose Askvik et al, 2020). Thus, writing remains an essential tool for communication and learning, involving a wide range of skills, from selecting the right words to organizing a coherent essay, all of which are vital for engaging with diverse audiences and purposes.

Writing is not an isolated skill but is deeply interconnected with other language skills such as listening, speaking, and reading. Teaching writing in conjunction with these skills provides a holistic approach to language learning. Kroll (1991) suggests that integrating language skills can be effectively achieved through activities like dictation, where students listen to passages, write key vocabulary on the board, and then reconstruct the passages from memory. This method engages multiple language skills simultaneously: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Integrative tasks like these encourage a more comprehensive learning experience, as students develop their vocabulary, grammar, and writing skills concurrently (Hyland, 2002; Weigle, 2002; Zamel, 1987; Zeleke, 2013).

The integrative approach to language teaching is particularly beneficial for enhancing writing proficiency. For instance, activities such as note-taking and discussions help students improve their writing skills while simultaneously engaging other language skills. This approach not only enhances students' writing abilities but also contributes to overall language competence, as they practice and refine their skills in a more meaningful and interconnected way.

2.1 Reasons for Using L1 in L2 Classrooms

The inclusion of an L1 in L2 classrooms has been widely debated, with many scholars advocating for its use. Nation (2003) highlights three key reasons for incorporating L1 in L2 environments: it creates a more natural learning atmosphere, facilitates communication, and provides emotional comfort. Utilizing L1 can make the classroom feel more familiar and comfortable, thus enhancing student engagement and participation, which is consistent with sociocultural theories emphasizing the role of social interactions in cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1978).

L1 can also improve communication, especially when students encounter complex concepts or instructions (Nation, 2003). Research supports the idea that L1 use enhances comprehension and reduces misunderstandings in L2 settings (Macaro, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 2000). By processing information in their native language, students can achieve better cognitive efficiency and improved learning outcomes (Cummins, 2007).

Furthermore, L1 use can ease the emotional challenges associated with L2 learning, particularly for students who are shy or lack confidence (Nation, 2003). This can reduce anxiety and embarrassment, fostering a more supportive learning environment (Auerbach, 1993). Krashen's

affective filter hypothesis reinforces this, suggesting that lowering emotional barriers aids in language acquisition (Krashen, 1982).

L1 use in L2 classrooms also contributes to a supportive social environment, essential for academic success. Despite teachers' efforts to limit L1, students often revert to their native language mentally during L2 learning, reflecting a deep cognitive reliance on L1 (Lee, 2010; Wells, 1999). Studies, such as Teklesellassie and Boersma's (2018) research on Amharic in English-medium courses, reveal positive attitudes toward L1 use, suggesting its benefits in diverse educational settings.

2.2 Effects of L1 in the L2 Classroom

In foreign language (FL) classrooms, students often experience tension between using their L2 and relying on their L1. This dynamic environment serves a dual purpose: teachers impart a new language while learners acquire one they might not have voluntarily chosen (Macaro, 1997).

The role of L1 in L2 instruction is contentious, particularly regarding its impact on learners' emotional and affective states. Harbord (1992) cautions against frequent L1 use, suggesting it could foster dependence, undermining L2 immersion and overall language acquisition. In contrast, Auerbach (1993) argues that incorporating L1 can lower affective filters, leading to better progress in L2 learning by reducing anxiety and creating a more supportive learning environment.

Recent studies present more complex views. Bakhtiari (2014) found that L1 inclusion did not significantly enhance learning outcomes compared to exclusive L2 instruction. However, Smolak et al. (2020) observed that code-switching could benefit bilingual students, facilitating academic success when alternating between languages. Spice (2018) emphasized that while code-switching is especially useful during the initial stages of language learning, its advantages diminish as learners near fluency.

Lee (2010) studied code-switching in Korean classrooms, showing that it generally enhances vocabulary learning more effectively than L2-exclusive instruction, particularly for younger learners. Teacher-led code-switching resulted in better retention and more significant vocabulary gains, especially with abstract vocabulary, where younger learners benefited more than adults.

Regarding writing skills, Nation (2003) advocates using L1 in L2 writing lessons, suggesting that L1 discussions before L2 writing tasks improve learners' comprehension and control of L2 vocabulary. This approach allows learners to grasp task content and develop relevant vocabulary in a supportive context, leading to better performance in subsequent L2 writing tasks. Nation also found that L1 translations were particularly effective, though maintaining a focus on L2 use remains crucial.

2.3 How Much L1 to Use in L2 Classes

Determining the appropriate amount of L1 use in L2 classrooms is essential for effective language teaching. Research indicates that L1 should be used strategically to offer necessary support while ensuring ample exposure to L2. According to Nation (2003), L1 can be particularly valuable for clarifying complex concepts and ensuring learners fully grasp task requirements. By providing explanations or instructions in L1, teachers can prevent misunderstandings that might arise from using L2 exclusively, especially for beginners or when addressing abstract topics. Additionally, Auerbach (1993) notes that L1 can help reduce learners' affective filters, decreasing anxiety and fostering a more supportive learning environment.

However, overreliance on L1 can hinder the immersive experience crucial for language acquisition. Macaro (2001) suggests that L1 use should be limited to no more than 10-20% of classroom time, allowing learners to predominantly engage with L2 while receiving occasional support when necessary. Harbord (1992) similarly advocates for minimal and strategic L1 use,

emphasizing the need to maximize L2 interaction and practice.

The ideal amount of L1 use varies based on learners' proficiency levels, the complexity of the material, and instructional goals. For instance, Smolak et al. (2020) found that bilingual students benefit from code-switching when dealing with challenging content, whereas advanced learners may need less L1 support. Lee's (2010) study on vocabulary acquisition in Korean EFL contexts revealed that code-switching is more advantageous for younger learners, suggesting that L1 use should be adapted to learners' age and proficiency.

In conclusion, while L1 use offers benefits such as improved comprehension and emotional support, it should be employed judiciously. A balanced approach, with L1 comprising no more than 10-20% of classroom time and adjusted to learners' needs, creates an optimal environment for language acquisition.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

This study sought to evaluate the impact of using students' first language (L1) in an English classroom on their English Writing Performance (EWP). To achieve this, an experimental research design was implemented, where the classroom language served as the independent variable, and the students' EWP as the dependent variable. The research primarily employed quantitative methods.

The study took place in the Dawro Zone of the Southwest Ethiopian Region (SWER), where the local language, Dawro Doona (Dawrotsuwa), is widely spoken and used as the medium of instruction in schools from grades one to four. It is also taught as a subject up to grade ten, used in teacher training for first-cycle teachers, and studied at the Bachelor of Arts (BA) level at universities. The Dawro Zone's capital, Tercha Town, is home to the Dawro Tercha Campus of Wolaita Sodo University, which hosts the Department of Dawrotsuwa Language and Literature. Students in this department, who are proficient in Dawro Doona, take the Sophomore English (EnLa 2043) course as part of their studies. The study focused on these students and the university teachers who taught writing skills courses.

The English Language and Literature Department was responsible for assigning teachers for all English courses on campus. Four teachers, all proficient in Dawro Doona, made up the department. To control for extraneous variables, such as differences in teaching styles, a female teacher with a Master's degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) and ten years of experience was selected for the study. She was briefed on the study's goals, the selected topics for writing lessons, teaching methods, assessment techniques, the intended use of code-switching, and how to ensure that code-switching was limited to planned instances only. This ensured that all factors, aside from language use, were kept constant.

Since the study aimed to assess the effects of L1 use on writing performance, it was essential to select a class where all students shared the same L1. The Department of Dawrotsuwa Language and Literature, where all students spoke Dawro Doona, was therefore chosen. The department had 68 second-year students, initially in one section. For the study, these students were divided into two sections based on their pretest scores, ensuring comparability between the groups. The pretest results were arranged in descending order, and students were alternately assigned to one of two groups.

To achieve the study's objectives, data were collected using pre-tests, post-tests, and interviews.

1. Pre-test: This was administered before dividing the students into groups to avoid discrepancies. The results were used to create two comparable groups, with even-numbered scores assigned to one group and odd-numbered scores to the other. The compositions were scored holistically, and the results were recorded in Microsoft Excel for further analysis.
2. Post-test: Conducted after the instructional sessions, the post-test assessed the effectiveness of the

treatment. Both groups completed the same essay writing activities under identical conditions. The essays were evaluated by both the course teacher and the researcher using an analytic scoring approach, ensuring consistency in evaluation criteria across both groups. The average scores were then analyzed.
3. Interview: Two teachers were interviewed to gather insights on the general use of L1 in English classrooms and the reasons behind its use.

The study also designed and administered items addressing four key features of writing: language, structure, idea development, and explicitness. Language-related items evaluated grammatical accuracy, spelling, punctuation, and correct tense usage. Structure-related items assessed the presence of a clear introduction, coherent sentence arrangement, effective paragraph division, smooth transitions within paragraphs, and a strong conclusion. Idea development items evaluated the sufficiency of points supporting the thesis statement, the credibility of evidence, the integration of external ideas, and proper citation of sources. Explicitness was measured by assessing whether key concepts were clearly defined, the essay's goals were explicitly stated, and linking words and phrases effectively indicated the relationship between ideas.

The mean score for each feature was calculated using SPSS by summing the results for all relevant elements and dividing by the number of elements. For example, the mean result for the structure was obtained by averaging the results for the clarity of introduction, sentence coherence, paragraph division, smooth transitions, and effectiveness of the conclusion.

The study compared the students' EWP between the experimental and control groups, focusing on each feature of writing. An independent-sample t-test was conducted using SPSS version 26 to compare the mean differences between the groups, and the overall performance across all writing features was also compared.

Before the experiment, a pre-test was administered, and students were grouped based on their results. A bilingual teacher proficient in both Dawro Doona and English was selected to teach both groups. The assignment of the experimental and control groups was determined by a lottery. The experiment lasted for an entire academic semester, following a pre-test-post-test control-group design. In the experimental group, the teacher used L1 when necessary, while in the control group, only English was used as the medium of instruction.

During the experiment, students engaged in essay writing sessions in class, followed by post-test sessions. The students' EWP was evaluated using an analytic approach with a checklist covering the key features of writing. Quantitative data were primarily required for the study, and statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS version 26. An independent sample t-test was used to compare the mean differences between the groups, and relationships between the students' performance across various writing features were examined.

The study was part of a PhD thesis, with ethical approval obtained from the proposal examiners at Addis Ababa University. All participants, who were above 18 years of age, were informed about the study and consented to participate.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Results

This section provides a comparative analysis of the mean results of participants' performance in essay writing. It aimed to compare the mean scores across various writing features, including language, structure, idea development, and explicitness, as well as the overall EWP. Due to the absence of five students (three from the EO group and two from the CS group) during the post-test, the analysis was conducted using the mean scores of 31 EO students and 32 CS students.

In order to ensure the establishment of equal ground between both groups, the comparison of

the mean values on the pretest between the groups was conducted using an independent sample t-test.

Table 1. The pretest results between groups.

Group	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	*F*	*sig*	*t*	*df*	*Sig(2-tailed)*	*d*
EO	34	4.750	1.6461	0.291						
					0.09	0.76	0.25	65	0.807	0.0599
CS	34	4.6571	1.45406	0.24578						

As the results in Table 1 shows, the F-value (0.092) with a significance level of 0.763 indicates that there is no significant difference in the variances between the two groups. The t-value (0.245) with 65 degrees of freedom results in a Sig(2-tailed) value of 0.807. This suggests that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups. Cohen's d, which measures the effect size, is 0.0599. This is a very small effect size, indicating that the difference between the two groups is negligible.

Table 2. Comparison of students' performance on language as a feature of writing between groups.

Group	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	*F*	*sig*	*t*	*df*	*Sig.(2-tailed)*	*d*
EO	31	3.07	.84	.15						
					10.08	.002	-2.832	47.37	.007	0.74
CS	32	3.56	.48	.08						

As the result in Table 2 shows, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the performance of language as a feature of writing in EWP for English only (EO) and code-switching (CS) groups.

Statistically significant differences were obtained with p = 0.007 which is much smaller than the conventional cut-off point (0.05) with (t (47.37) = -2.832, p = 0.007) in the scores with the mean score for EO (M= 3.0726, SD = .83963) and for CS (M = 3.5625, SD = .47941). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -.48992, 95% cl: -.83785 to -.14199) was significant. Therefore, the participants who attended the class where code-switching was allowed performed significantly higher in maintaining language as a feature of writing at EWP with the Cohen's d 0.74 which suggested a moderate effect size.

Table 3. Comparison of EWP on structure as a feature of writing between groups.

Group	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	*F*	*sig*	*t*	*df*	*Sig.(2-tailed)*	*d*
EO	31	2.63	.88	.16						
					7.142	.01	-1.648	53.973	.105	0.43
CS	32	2.94	.62	.11						

As the results in Table 3 show, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the performance of structure as a feature of writing in EWP for English only (EO) and code-switching (CS) groups.

There were no statistically significant differences as p 0.105 is bigger than the conventional cut-off point (0.05) with (t (53.973) = -1.648, p = 0.105) in the scores with the mean score for EO (m= 2.6258, sd = .88052) and for CS (m = 2.9438, sd = .62473). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -.31794, 95% cl: -
.70467 to .06878) was not significant. Therefore, the participants who were allowed to switch codes to their mother tongue did not perform significantly higher in maintaining structure as a feature of

writing at EWP although the Cohen's d 0.43 suggested a modest effect size. As a result, the alternative hypothesis (h1) which students who attend the class where classroom code-switching (CS) is allowed perform better in writing than the students who attend the English class where only English is used as a medium, was not supported in structure as a feature of writing at essay writing.

Table 4. Comparison of EWP on idea development as a feature of writing between groups.

Group	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	*F*	*sig*	*t*	*df*	*Sig.(2-tailed)*	*d*
EO	31	2.86	.87	.15						
					7.941	.007	-3.089	50.321	.003	.8
CS	32	3.43	.55	.10						

The results in Table 4 show the comparison of the mean performance on idea development as a feature of writing between experimental and control groups. An independent-samples t-test indicates that there were statistically significant differences between the groups with p = 0.003 which is far less than the conventional cut-off point (0.05) with (t (50.321) = -3.089, p = 0.003) in the scores with the mean score for EO (M= 2.8629, SD = .86804) and for CS (M = 3.4297, SD = .54711). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -.56678, 95% cl: -.93523 to -.19834) was significant. Therefore, the participants who were deliberately allowed to switch codes to their mother tongue performed significantly better in maintaining on idea development as a feature of writing at EWP with the Cohen's d 0.8 which suggested a moderate effect size. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H1), that students who attend the class where classroom code-switching (CS) is allowed perform better in writing than the students who attend the English class where only English is used as a medium, was supported at idea development as a feature of writing of essay writing.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the performance of explicitness as a feature of writing in EWP for experimental and control groups as it is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of EWP on explicitness as a feature of writing between groups.

Group	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	*F*	*sig*	*t*	*df*	*Sig.(2-tailed)*	*d*
EO	31	3.28	.80	.14						
					5.403	.023	-2.635	48.223	.011	.7
CS	32	3.72	.47	.08						

The result shows that there were statistically significant differences with (t (48.223) = -2.635, p = 0.011) in the scores with the mean score for EO (M= 3.2796, SD = .80322) and for CS (M = 3.7188, SD = .47224). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -.43918, 95% cl: -.77426 to -.1041) was significant. Therefore, the participants who were deliberately allowed to switch codes to their mother tongue performed significantly higher in maintaining on explicitness as a feature of writing at EWP and the Cohen's d 0.7 suggested a moderate effect size. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H1), that students who attend the class where classroom code-switching (CS) is allowed perform better in writing than the students who attend the English class where only English is used as a medium, was supported in explicitness as a feature of writing at EWP level.

Regarding the comparison across features of writing between groups, the data were analyzed to examine on which features of writing the students' performances have shown bigger mean differences. In order to gain the result, the mean values were computed in the SPSS 26 and the mean differences (MD) were taken to compare the differences as presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Comparison of students' PWP within features of writing between groups.

Group	*Language*				*Structure*				*Idea Development*				*Explicitness*			
	N	M	SD	MD	N	M	SD	MD	N	M	SD	MD	N	M	SD	MD
EO	31	3.07	.84		31	2.63	.88		31	2.86	.87		31	3.28	.80	
				.49				.31				.57				.44
CS	32	3.56	.48		32	2.94	.62		32	3.43	.55		32	3.72	.47	

The results showed that the biggest MD (0.57) was observed in idea development as a feature of writing. This indicates that those who were in the CS class have shown better EWP than those who were in EO class in maintaining the idea development. The next biggest MD (0.49) was observed in language as a feature of writing suggesting that the CS group maintained language elements better than the EO group. The third biggest MD was 0.44 which was gained in explicitness as a feature of writing, and the smallest MD was obtained in structure as a feature of writing. The smallest MD on structure as a feature of writing shows that the students in the class where CS was used and those who attended the EO class performed relatively similar in maintaining structure.

The comparison of mean of students' EWP between the groups was conducted to examine which instructional type (CS or EO) yields higher performance of students' overall essay writing. Thus, an independent-samples t-test, as in Table 7, was conducted to compare the performance of essay writing for English only (EO) and code-switching (CS) groups.

Table 7. Differences in EWP between groups.

Group	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SEM*	*F*	*sig*	*t*	*df*	*Sig.(2-tailed)*	*d*
EO	31	2.95	.81	.14						
					10.301	.002	-2.779	47.504	.008	0.75
CS	32	3.42	.46	.08						

The results show that there were statistically significant differences because the p-value of 0.008 is much smaller than the conventional significance cut-off point. In addition, (t (47.502) = -2.779, p = 0.008) in the scores with the mean score for EO (M= 2.9602, SD = .81367) and CS (M = 3.4137, SD = .46017) was gained. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -.46351, 95% cl: -.79891 to -.12812) was found to be significant.

Therefore, there were statistically significant differences in figures that show the higher performance of the experimental group (where code-switching was deliberately allowed in the classroom) than the control group (where only English is used as a medium of instruction). Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H1), that students who attend the class where classroom CS is allowed perform better in writing than the students who attend the English class where only English is used as a medium, was supported by the moderate strength of the effect size (d=0.75).

4.2 Discussion

This study investigated the impact of first language (L1) use in English language classrooms on students' essay writing performance (EWP). The research employed a pretest-posttest design along with interviews to gather data. While the influence of L1 varied across different writing features, a significant positive effect was observed on students' essay writing. Specifically, statistically significant improvements were noted in idea development, language use, and explicitness, all with moderate effect sizes. However, although improvements in writing structure were noted, the effect size was modest and not statistically significant.

In terms of overall essay writing, the use of code-switching (CS) was found to enhance students' performance. Interview responses supported this finding, with teachers highlighting the role of L1 in facilitating student understanding. One teacher explained that using the mother tongue depends on students' comprehension levels, noting that many students struggle to understand

lessons delivered entirely in English. Another teacher mentioned that students were more comfortable and confident when certain concepts were explained in their first language, which encouraged them to ask questions and engage more actively in class.

These results align with previous research by Auerbach (1993) and Nation (2003), who suggested that L1 use lowers students' affective filters, leading to improved L2 learning. Similar conclusions were drawn by Lee (2010) and Smolak et al. (2020), who found that CS contributes to academic success and benefits bilingual students facing L2 challenges. However, the study also cautions against over-reliance on L1 in L2 classrooms, echoing Harbord's (1992) concerns about the potential drawbacks, such as an increased dependence on L1, which could undermine the development of L2 proficiency.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The objective of the study was to examine the effect of L1 use on students' EWP in English language classroom. To this end, an experimental study was carried out grouping sixty eight second year undergraduate into two groups: experimental and control based on the pretest results. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, comparisons of the means were made. The analysis of the data was running an independent-samples t-test in SPSS 26. The grand total mean of the students' EWP between the groups showed that there were statistically significant differences between groups suggesting that the students who attended the code-switching class performed higher than those who attended the class where English only was the medium of instruction. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H1) that "students who attend the class where classroom CS is allowed perform better in essay writing than the students who attend the English class where only English is used as a medium" was supported.

The task of improving L2 teaching and advancing students' performance in L2 learning is what every concerned body should share. Based on the results, it is recommended that the L2 teachers, language policy makers, and school principals should be aware of the context where L2 teaching takes place. As a result, they should encourage principled and professionally planned use of students' L1 where needed.

REFERENCES

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English-only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*(1), 9-32. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586949

Bakhtiari, Z. (2014). Code-switching and learning general knowledge of vocabulary in the Iranian university context. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 2*(2), 68-73.

Cumming, A. (2001). Learning to write in a second language: Two decades of research. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 1-23.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 221-240.

Dougherty, B. (1985) *Composing choices for writes: A cross-disciplinary rhetoric.*

McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal, 46*(4), 350-355. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.4.350

Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing*. Longman.

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.

Kroll, B. (1991). *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom.* Cambridge University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.

Lee, H. (2010). *The differential effects of teacher code-switching on the vocabulary acquisition of adult and young EFL learners: A study in the Korean context* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford]. Oxford University Research Archieve.https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:7cce31e4-60f9-4998-95c1- 4fa7cef5ad0b

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Multilingual Matters.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' code-switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and methods. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(4), 531-548. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00124

Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers* (pp. 63-84). Springer.

Mueller, P. A., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2014). The pen is mightier than the keyboard: advantages of longhand over laptop note taking. *Psychological Science, 25*(6), 1159-1168. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614524581

Nation, I. S. P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal, 5*(2), 1-8.

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Ose Askvik, E., van der Weel, F. R., & van der Meer, A. L. H. (2020). The importance of cursive handwriting over typewriting for learning in the classroom: A high-density eeg study of 12-year-old children and young adults. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 1810. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01810

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*

(3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Smolak, E., de Anda, S., Enriquez, B., Poulin-Dubois, D., & Friend, M. (2020). Code-switching in young bilingual toddlers: A longitudinal, cross-language investigation. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 23*(3), 500–518. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728919000257

Spice, A. K. (2018). The effects of code-mixing on second language development.

Channels: Where Disciplines Meet, 3(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.15385/jch.2018.3.1.1

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 760-770. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588224

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 251 274.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge University Press.

Woodall, B. R. (2002). Language-switching: Using the first language while writing in a second language. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(1), 7-28.https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00051-0

Zamel, V. (1987). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(2), 195-209. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586792

Zeleke, A. (2013). *Training in the learning strategies of writing: Its effects on students' writing skills* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Addis Ababa University.

Article 2: Examining the Impact of Code-Switching on Students' Paragraph Writing in EFL Classrooms

Article

JELITA: Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature Volume 6, Number 1, February 2025, pages 204-218

Examining the Impact of Code-Switching on Students' Paragraph Writing in EFL Classrooms

P-ISSN 2721-1096
E-ISSN 2721-1916

Markos Medhin Mekuria

Addis Aababa University, Ethiopia

Nuru Mohammed

Addis Aababa University, Ethiopia

Abstract

The use of learners' first language (L1) within target language instruction remains a contentious issue in language education. This study investigated the impact of code-switching on students' paragraph writing performance in target Language (L2) classroom. Employing an experimental research design, data were gathered through pre-tests, post-tests, and semi-structured interviews. The participants consisted of second-year university students enrolled in a Sophomore English course, which focuses on foundational writing skills. Based on pre-test results, 68 students majoring in Dawro Doonaa (Dawro language) were systematically divided into two groups: a control group (n = 33), where English was used exclusively as the medium of instruction, and an experimental group (n = 35), where code-switching to the first language was permitted. Upon completion of the instructional intervention, post-tests were administered, and two instructors were interviewed to provide additional insights into student performance. Statistical analysis conducted using SPSS version 26 revealed no statistically significant difference in overall paragraph writing performance between the two groups (p = 0.46). Nevertheless, the experimental group demonstrated marked improvement in specific dimensions of writing, notably explicitness and idea development. These findings underscore the potential pedagogical value of judicious L1 use, suggesting that EFL instructors and policymakers should critically assess its role rather than entirely exclude it from classroom practice.

Keywords

Code-Switching, Dawro Doona, First Language, Paragraph Writing, Writing Performance

Corresponding author:

Markos Medhin Mekuria, Addis Aababa University, Ethiopia Email: markofmedan@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

In today's globalised world, nearly every community is either bilingual or interacts with bilingual individuals, making the need to learn a second language increasingly important. People worldwide now frequently study additional languages (L2) as either second or foreign languages. Although Ethiopia is a country rich in linguistic, ethnic, and cultural diversity with over 80 ethnic groups, English remains a dominant language in education, business, and administration. In urban areas, it is common to see business signs, institutional logos, and official documents written in both English and local languages. However, in many parts of Ethiopia, English usage is often limited to classroom instruction. In these areas, students' exposure to English is restricted to hearing their teacher speak it in lessons where English is the medium of instruction (Eshetie, 2013). In contexts where students and teachers share the same first language, the use of L1 for communication inside and outside the classroom is prevalent. In these contexts, using L1 in the L2 classroom can be essential, but the question remains: does L1 use support or hinder L2 learning?

Over time, different methods for teaching L2 have varied in their stance on L1 use. Some methods, like the Grammar Translation Method, advocate for L1 use, while others, like the Direct Method, completely reject it. Both approaches have limitations, leading to methods that suggest a balanced use of L1, such as the Notional Functional, Oral Situational Method, and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). However, debates continue regarding the "optimal extent" of L1 use, the contexts in which it is effective, and how much L1 should be used to assist students struggling with L2 comprehension.

Moreover, teachers face significant challenges when deciding whether and how to use L1 in English classrooms. Some feel guilty or lack confidence when employing CS, fearing criticism from colleagues, parents, or administrators who may view L1 use as a sign of poor English proficiency or a compromise in education quality. Meanwhile, students form varied perceptions of their teachers based on their language use, associating it with traits such as kindness, strictness, or arrogance. These perceptions and judgments often occur without a solid theoretical or empirical basis, leaving both teachers and stakeholders without clear guidance on the most effective practices.

This study focuses on writing skills due to its manageability, as opposed to speaking skills, in exploring the effects of code-switching. Speaking skills require extensive time and resources, making it challenging to control variables such as time of day, presentation order, and peer influence, all of which may impact performance. Additionally, code-switching in speaking can directly influence students' spoken outputs, complicating the evaluation process. In contrast, writing tasks can be conducted simultaneously across groups, minimizing external influences on individual performance. Writing also involves structured stages—pre-writing, drafting, editing, and finalizing—providing ample time for students to gather ideas, revise, and seek support. This extended preparation period allows natural integration of code-switching within the learning process. Furthermore, integrating code-switching from speaking into writing lessons adds a natural dimension to language instruction, supporting skill integration. Therefore, the study prioritizes writing as the target skill to evaluate the effects of code-switching effectively. This focus aligns with the structured and controllable nature of writing activities, offering reliable insights into the role of code-switching in language learning.

Previous studies on L1 use in L2 classrooms have explored various areas, including the role of L1 (Nation, 2003; Simasiku et al., 2015), the implications of code-switching (Lee, 2012), and L1's effect on supporting students' learning (Al-Adnani & Elyas, 2016; Allen, 2015; Lee, 2010; Spice, 2018).

These studies differ from the present research as they focus on different settings, subjects, and designs. In Ethiopia, studies by (Beressa, 2003; Habtamu, 2013; Teklesellassie & Boersma, 2018) have investigated attitudes towards code-switching and L1 use in English classrooms, but they have not addressed whether code-switching has a beneficial or harmful impact on L2 learning, particularly in areas like paragraph writing. Therefore, the primary goal of this research is to provide empirical evidence by assessing the impact of code-switching on students' paragraph writing performance. It focuses on comparing the outcomes of code-switching (CS) and English-only (EO) instruction to determine which approach yields better performance. Additionally, the study seeks to identify which specific aspects of writing—language, structure, idea development, and explicitness—are most influenced by code-switching.

To achieve the objectives of the study, the following hypotheses were tested: the null hypothesis (H_0) stated that there is no difference in paragraph writing performance between students in classes where code-switching (CS) is used and those where only English is used. In contrast, the alternative hypothesis (H_1) proposed that students in classes where code-switching is employed perform better in paragraph writing than those in classes where only English is used.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing is a dynamic and multifaceted process that requires interaction among the text, the writer, and the reader. This interplay demands that writers carefully consider these elements to construct coherent and meaningful texts (Silva & Matsuda, 2002). Recent research highlights the interactive and iterative nature of writing, wherein meaning is co-constructed by the writer's intent and the reader's interpretation, shaped by their prior knowledge (Jiang & Hyland, 2022). In contemporary contexts, the proliferation of digital platforms has further complicated the nature of written communication, requiring adaptability to diverse genres and audience expectations (Zhang & Liao, 2020). Writing is deeply embedded in sociocultural and institutional norms, making it inherently contextual. As Kern (2000) and Hyland (2002) argued, written communication is inseparable from the social, academic, or professional environments in which it is produced. More recent studies affirm that cultural and institutional contexts significantly influence writing conventions and learner outcomes (Guo & Lin, 2021). Moreover, writing is collaborative, often shaped by interactions such as peer reviews, teacher feedback, and group activities, which facilitate knowledge construction and idea refinement (Storch, 2019). Collaborative writing practices remain a cornerstone of effective pedagogy, enabling learners to co-construct meaning and enhance their writing skills (Ellis, 2019). Despite its importance, writing remains one of the most challenging language skills to master (Alsamadani, 2010). This complexity is compounded in second or foreign language (L2) contexts, where learners must navigate linguistic, cognitive, and cultural barriers. Studies have shown that L2 learners often struggle with grammar, vocabulary, coherence, and idea development, which can impede their ability to produce well-structured texts (Yu & Zhang, 2023; Sahib et al., 2021). Targeted instructional interventions, such as explicit feedback and scaffolding, are critical in addressing these challenges and improving learners' writing proficiency (Andrade, 2019).

2.1 Integrating Language Skills

Language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—are intrinsically linked, with no single skill functioning in isolation. Modern pedagogical approaches advocate for the integration of

these skills to create meaningful and authentic learning experiences (Hinkel, 2021). For instance, pre-writing activities, such as brainstorming and group discussions, can help students articulate their ideas orally before translating them into written form (Arficho, 2013). Similarly, exposure to authentic input through listening and reading can enhance learners' understanding of linguistic structures, vocabulary, and text organization, which are critical for developing writing proficiency (Nation, 2020). Studies emphasize the benefits of integrating language skills for writing development. For example, listening to lectures or podcasts can provide models for structuring arguments, while reading diverse texts can familiarize learners with genre-specific conventions (Graham & Perin, 2019). Group work and collaborative discussions, in particular, have been shown to improve writing fluency and coherence by promoting idea generation and reducing cognitive load (Ellis, 2019).

2.2 The Role of Code-Switching in Language Learning

Code-switching (CS) has been a subject of considerable debate in L2 classrooms. Macaro (1997) described the foreign language classroom as a unique environment where learners and teachers often operate in an unfamiliar linguistic and cultural space. This unfamiliarity can create challenges, particularly when teachers adopt an English-only (EO) approach, which may limit students' ability to draw on their L1 as a resource for learning. Recent research has highlighted the potential benefits of CS in supporting language acquisition and classroom management. Spice (2018) found that strategic L1 use, particularly in the early stages of L2 learning, can help clarify complex concepts and reduce learner anxiety. Similarly, Elian et al. (2023) argued that occasional L1 use can create a more inclusive and supportive learning environment, especially for learners with limited L2 exposure outside the classroom.

In writing instruction, L1 plays a significant role in facilitating task comprehension and idea development. Nation (2003) noted that allowing learners to discuss tasks in their L1 before completing them in L2 can enhance their understanding of the content and improve their written output. This is particularly relevant in writing lessons, where students often struggle to organize and articulate their thoughts in a second language. By discussing tasks in their L1, learners can better grasp the task requirements, generate ideas, and familiarize themselves with relevant L2 vocabulary.

2.3 Code-Switching and Writing Performance

Studies examining the impact of CS on writing performance have yielded mixed results. Bakhtiari (2014) found that while CS did not significantly enhance overall learning outcomes, it did facilitate task comprehension and vocabulary retention. In contrast, Garza and Nava (2005) reported that students who employed CS were more successful in bilingual settings, particularly in tasks requiring higher-order cognitive skills, such as writing.

In the Korean context, Lee (2010) found that CS was particularly effective for younger learners, who demonstrated improved vocabulary retention and writing fluency when allowed to switch between L1 and L2. However, the effectiveness of CS tends to diminish as learners become more proficient in L2, suggesting that its utility is context-dependent and may vary based on learners' proficiency levels and task complexity (Spice, 2018). More recent studies have also explored the role of CS in specific aspects of writing, such as coherence, explicitness, and idea development. For example, Sahib et al. (2021) found that students who used CS in pre-writing discussions produced more coherent and well-structured essays compared to those in EO classrooms. Similarly, Yu and Zhang (2023)

reported that L1 use during brainstorming sessions helped learners generate more ideas and organize their thoughts more effectively.

2.4 Academic Writing and Code-Switching

Academic writing is characterized by several core features, including structure, coherence, critical engagement, and explicit use of sources (Greetham, 2001; WDC, 2009). These features require learners to not only present their ideas clearly but also support them with evidence and logical reasoning. The integration of CS in writing instruction can support these objectives by allowing learners to scaffold their understanding and focus on higher-order writing skills.

For instance, pre-writing activities conducted in L1 can help learners develop their arguments more thoroughly, while L2 writing tasks can refine their ability to articulate those arguments in the target language. This dual approach enables learners to bridge the gap between their cognitive understanding and linguistic expression, ultimately enhancing the quality of their academic writing (Nation, 2003).

2.5 Implications for Pedagogy

The findings from recent studies underscore the need for a balanced approach to L1 use in L2 classrooms. While excessive reliance on L1 can hinder L2 immersion, strategic and judicious use of CS can provide significant pedagogical benefits, particularly in writing instruction. Teachers should consider incorporating L1 in pre-writing activities, brainstorming sessions, and task discussions to facilitate comprehension and idea generation. Additionally, CS can be used to provide targeted feedback on writing tasks, helping learners address specific linguistic or conceptual challenges. Generally, code-switching represents a valuable pedagogical tool that, when used strategically, can enhance learners' writing performance and overall language proficiency. As writing continues to be a challenging skill for L2 learners, integrating CS into writing instruction can provide a supportive framework for developing coherence, explicitness, and critical engagement in learners' written work. Future research should further explore the nuanced role of CS across different contexts, proficiency levels, and writing genres to optimize its application in language classrooms.

RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 Study Design

This research sought to investigate the effect of classroom code-switching (CS) on students' paragraph writing performance through the application of an experimental research design. The independent variable was the instructional method—either English-only (EO) or code-switching (CS)—while the dependent variable was the students' performance in paragraph writing. Given its reliance on numerical data subjected to statistical analysis, the study adopted a predominantly quantitative approach.

3.2 Study Setting

The research was conducted at Wolayta Sodo University, specifically at the Dawro Tercha Campus, situated in the Dawro Zone of the South West Ethiopian Region (SWER). The campus hosts

a department dedicated to Dawro Doona (Dawro language), which admits students after their completion of freshman-level courses to pursue specialization in the language. Dawro Doona, also referred to as Dawroothuwa, serves as the principal medium of communication in the local community. It functions as the instructional language for grades one to four and is taught as a subject through grade ten. Moreover, it is employed as the language of instruction in teacher training colleges for first-cycle educators and is studied at the university level, where students can earn a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree (Gabayyo, 1998; FDRE, 1994).

For this study, the "Sophomore English (EnLa 2043)" course, which emphasizes foundational writing skills, was purposefully selected as the focus. This choice allowed the researcher to examine the impact of code-switching on students' paragraph writing performance in an academic context.

3.3 Participants

The study's participants comprised two groups: students specializing in Dawro Doona at Wolayta Sodo University's Dawro Tercha Campus and instructors teaching Writing Skills courses. The Department of English Language and Literature at the campus employed four English language lecturers—two male and two female. Among them, three held Master of Arts (MA) degrees in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), while one had an MA in Linguistics. All four were proficient in Dawro Doona. For the purposes of this study, the department designated a female lecturer with a TEFL MA degree and a decade of teaching experience to lead both the experimental and control groups. Her selection aimed to minimize potential bias arising from teacher variability, as she was able to manage both groups with consistency aside from the instructional differences.

The student participants included all 68 second-year Dawro Doona students enrolled in the "Sophomore English" course, as no other cohort was undertaking Writing Skills courses during the data collection period. These students had completed their freshman courses within the same section. Following consultations with the campus dean, the academic affairs office, department heads, and the course instructor, the students were divided into two groups for the study. To ensure comparable proficiency levels, a pretest was administered, and the participants were grouped based on their pretest performance.

3.4 Data Collection

Three tools were employed to gather data: a pretest, a posttest, and semi-structured interviews. The pretest assessed the students' initial writing proficiency to establish baseline equivalence between the two groups, eliminating potential pre-existing disparities. A holistic scoring method was used to evaluate the pretest compositions, and the results were organized in Microsoft Excel. Students were then sorted by their pretest scores, with even-numbered students assigned to one group and odd-numbered students to the other. The determination of the experimental and control groups was carried out using a lottery method conducted by the researcher and course instructor. The experimental group received instruction incorporating code-switching, while the control group adhered strictly to English-only instruction.

The posttest was administered after the intervention to evaluate students' progress. Both groups received identical lessons for an academic semester. An analytic scoring method was employed to assess the posttest compositions, using a checklist of 15 criteria: five for paragraph structure, three for idea development, three for clarity, and four for language use. Each criterion was rated on a scale

ranging from No Error (4) to Frequent Errors (1). The compositions were scored independently by the researcher and the instructor, and the average scores were used for analysis.

Additionally, interviews were conducted with two selected instructors to gather qualitative data on their perceptions of students' writing performance and the influence of integrating L1 into classroom instruction. These interviews explored the instructors' views on the role of L1 in facilitating student learning and their rationale for incorporating code-switching as part of their pedagogical approach.

3.5 Data Analysis

The study primarily utilized quantitative data, which was analyzed using SPSS version 26. An independent samples t-test was performed to compare the mean scores of the experimental and control groups on the posttest. Further analysis involved comparing mean scores across different writing features to evaluate the relationships between instructional methods and specific aspects of writing performance. Qualitative data from the interviews were analyzed thematically to provide supplementary insights into the quantitative findings.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

As the study was of an experimental nature, the participants were divided into two groups: the control group and the experimental group. To determine the composition of these groups and to ensure an equitable baseline, a pre-test was administered, and participants were allocated to the groups according to the pre-test results.

Table 1: The pretest results between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	Sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed)	d
English only	33	5.12	1.45	0.25						
					0.012	0.914	-0.065	66	0.948	0.02
Code-Switching	35	5.14	1.29	0.22						

Table 1 presents the mean results of the pre-test scores for the control and experimental groups. The data indicate that the mean scores of both groups were nearly equivalent, suggesting that the pre-test was effective in establishing a baseline of comparability between the two groups prior to the intervention. The slight variations observed in the scores, while minimal, are not unexpected and may result from inherent differences in individual student performance. Such discrepancies are commonplace in experimental research, particularly when participants are randomly assigned to groups. To further enhance the validity of the grouping, the pre-test scores were meticulously arranged in descending order. This systematic approach ensured that students with the highest scores were paired with those with the lowest scores, thereby minimising potential biases that could affect the

outcomes of the study. By categorising students based on odd and even numbering, the researchers aimed to achieve a more balanced distribution of abilities across the two groups. Overall, the data depicted in Table 1 support the conclusion that the grouping method employed was effective in establishing a controlled environment for the subsequent phases of the study, thereby contributing to the reliability of the findings.

Table 2: Comparison of PWP on features of writing between groups

Feature of writing	Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	Sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed)	d
Language	English only	31	2.68	0.67	0.12						
						0.120	0.731	-1.876	62	0.065	0.47
	Code - switching	33	2.98	0.61	0.10						
Structure	English only	31	2.71	.74	.13						
						.201	.655	-.955	62	.343	0.48
	Code - switching	33	2.88	.73	.13						
Idea Development	English only	31	2.49	.53	.09						
						1.229	.272	-2.161	62	.035	0.56
	Code switching	33	2.82	.66	.11						
Explicitness	English only	31	2.54	.60	.11						
						.174	.678	-2.131	62	.037	0.53
	Code-switching	33	2.87	.64	.11						

Table 2 presents a comparison of paragraph writing performance (PWP) between two groups—students taught using English-only instruction and those taught using code-switching. The analysis focuses on four key features of writing: language**,** structure**,** idea development**,** and explicitness**.** For each feature, the table provides statistical indicators, which assess whether the differences in writing performance between the two groups are statistically significant and meaningful.

The first feature analyzed is *language*, which pertains to students' mastery of vocabulary, grammar, and sentence construction. The English-only group consisted of 31 participants with a mean score of 2.68, a standard deviation (SD) of 0.67, and a standard error of the mean (SEM) of 0.12. Meanwhile, the code-switching group included 33 participants, who achieved a higher mean score of 2.98 with a smaller standard deviation of 0.61 and an SEM of 0.10. Despite the apparent difference in mean scores, statistical analysis reveals that this difference is not statistically significant. The F-value of 0.120 and its associated significance level ($p = 0.731$) indicate that there is no substantial variance between the groups. The independent samples t-test further supports this conclusion, as the t-value (-1.876) is not significant at the conventional threshold ($p = 0.065$, two-tailed). However, the effect size ($d = 0.47$) suggests a medium effect, indicating that the observed difference might have some practical significance even though it lacks statistical significance.

The second feature, *structure*, refers to the organization and coherence of paragraphs, including

topic sentences, transitions, and logical flow. The English-only group achieved a mean score of 2.71 (SD = 0.74, SEM = 0.13), while the code-switching group had a slightly higher mean of 2.88 (SD = 0.73, SEM = 0.13). The F-value for variance equality is 0.201 (p = 0.655), indicating homogeneity of variances between the groups. The t-test result (-0.955) shows that the difference in mean scores is not statistically significant (p = 0.343). Although the effect size (d = 0.48) suggests a medium effect, the lack of statistical significance implies that the observed difference may not necessarily reflect a true effect of instructional method on students' performance in paragraph structure.

The third feature analyzed is *idea development*, which evaluates the depth, clarity, and relevance of ideas expressed in students' paragraphs. The English-only group recorded a mean score of 2.49 (SD = 0.53, SEM = 0.09), while the code-switching group achieved a higher mean score of 2.82 (SD = 0.66, SEM = 0.11). The statistical analysis indicates that this difference is significant. The F-value is 1.229 (p = 0.272), suggesting no significant variance in standard deviations between the groups. However, the t-value (-2.161) is statistically significant at the 0.05 level (p = 0.035, two-tailed), indicating that the code-switching group outperformed the English-only group in idea development. Furthermore, the effect size (d = 0.56) reflects a medium to large effect, reinforcing the practical significance of this finding. These results suggest that integrating students' first language through code-switching may have a meaningful positive impact on their ability to generate and develop ideas in their writing.

The final feature, *explicitness*, assesses the clarity and precision of students' writing, particularly in conveying meaning without ambiguity. The English-only group scored an average of 2.54 (SD = 0.60, SEM = 0.11), while the code-switching group performed better, with a mean score of 2.87 (SD = 0.64, SEM = 0.11). The F-value for variance equality is 0.174 (p = 0.678), confirming that the variances between the two groups are similar. The t-test result (-2.131) is statistically significant (p = 0.037, two-tailed), indicating that the code-switching group significantly outperformed the English-only group in terms of explicitness. The effect size (d = 0.53) also demonstrates a medium effect, suggesting that the use of code-switching may facilitate greater precision and clarity in students' writing.

Table 3: Differences in overall PWP between groups

Group	N	M	SD	SEM	F	sig	t	df	Sig(2-tailed)	d
English only	31	2.63	.57	.10						
					.137	.713	-1.791	62	.078	0.46
Code switching	33	2.89	.62	.11						

Table 3 encompasses the computed mean value of all fifteen items which are categorised under features of writing (language, structure, idea development and explicitness) to assess the PWP. It presents a comparison of the overall paragraph writing performance (PWP) between the English-only group and the code-switching group. The English-only group (N = 31) had a mean (M) score of 2.63, with a standard deviation (SD) of 0.57 and a standard error of the mean (SEM) of 0.10. The code-switching group (N = 33) achieved a higher mean score of 2.89, with an SD of 0.62 and an SEM of 0.11. The F-value of 0.137 and significance level (sig) of 0.713 indicate no significant difference in the variances between the groups. Although the t-test result (t = -1.791, df =62) shows a higher mean score

for the code-switching group, the two-tailed significance value of 0.078 suggests that the difference in overall PWP between the groups is not statistically significant. The effect size (d = 0.46) suggests a small to moderate practical significance, indicating that code-switching had a noticeable but not statistically significant effect on overall writing performance compared to using English only.

As the results from the interview shows, it can be learned that L1 use of the teachers increases classroom participation rate of students, helps teachers know how much the students understand the lesson and make the classroom more convenient to students. Interviewee 1 believed that students generally benefit from L1 use, but how much they benefit depends on the students' learning ability. He claimed that high achievers gain more benefit from code-switching as it increases their understanding on the lesson. The slow learners are also benefited because L1 use at least helps them understand the lesson content.

... it depends on students themselves. For some students especially for high and middle achievers, when you use Dawrotsuwa words for the terms they may not easily understand if not said in their mother tongue, that accelerates their learning. In turn that helps them achieve better. But for shy and slow learners, that may encourage them to expect everything in Dawrotswa. But still at least they understand the lesson when their first language is used (interviewee 1).

Interviewee 2 also shared the same view, but pointed that too much use of L1 should be warned.

From my experience, students perform better when their first language is used in the classroom because they understand the content of the lesson very well when their mother tongue is used. But overuse of the mother tongue makes the classroom Dawro Doona class. So the extent of mother tongue the teacher uses should be noted (interviewee 2).

Interviewee 1 further explained how comfortable the students become when their L1 is used in the classroom and how much that supports students learning saying:

... they are very happy when some concepts are expressed in their first language. You can see this from their face. They also feel confident to ask questions when they don't understand. If you use only English, you see students with dark face may be struggling to understand the lesson, but they don't ask questions, even they don't answer your questions if you don't allow them to use their first language.

However, as Interviewee 2 stated, the extent of L1 use should be seriously tested out in order to avoid the total shift of medium of instruction into L1.

Concerning the effects of code-switching on students' writing performance, Interviewee 2 claimed that code-switching could help students for free writing tasks than for controlled ones.

I think it (code-switching) helps for all, but it may help more for free writing because for controlled writing the words or expressions they supply are more limited, but during free writing, if the students are allowed to gather as much information as possible from the teacher and their peer students and if they ask English words they don't know, I think they can write better. Generally, even though teachers believed that students would generally benefit from code-switching, the result shows that CS has no statistically significant effect on students' writing performance.

Discussion

This study examined the effect of CS on students' PWP in an English language classroom. A total of 68 students were divided into two groups: one that adhered strictly to EO instruction and another that allowed students to switch to L1 during writing tasks. The findings revealed no

statistically significant difference in overall PWP between the two groups. However, the CS group achieved a slightly higher mean score (M = 2.89) compared to the EO group (M = 2.63), with the difference approaching but not reaching statistical significance (p = 0.078). The effect size (d = 0.46) indicated a small to moderate practical significance, suggesting that CS may exert a meaningful influence on writing performance despite the lack of statistical significance.

The results demonstrate a consistent trend: the CS group outperformed the EO group across all four features of writing. However, the statistical significance of these differences varied. While the CS group showed statistically significant improvements in Idea Development and Explicitness, the differences in Language and Structure were not significant. Nevertheless, the effect sizes for all features (ranging from 0.47 to 0.56) indicate small to moderate practical significance, suggesting that code-switching holds promise as an instructional strategy for enhancing writing performance. The findings suggest that code-switching may be particularly beneficial for complex cognitive processes like Idea Development and Explicitness, where students must synthesize, organize, and clearly express their thoughts. By allowing students to draw on their first language, code-switching potentially reduces cognitive load and fosters deeper engagement with the writing task. This advantage may explain the significant improvements observed in these features. On the other hand, the lack of significant differences in Language and Structure may reflect the need for a longer intervention period to observe measurable changes. Alternatively, these aspects of writing may rely more heavily on explicit instruction and practice in English, which may not be fully addressed by code-switching alone. The findings are consistent with previous studies (Sahib et al., 2021; Yu and Zhang, 2023) that have explored that CS has a constructive role in specific aspects of writing, such as coherence, explicitness, and idea development.

In conclusion, while CS did not significantly enhance overall PWP, it had a demonstrable positive impact on specific writing elements, particularly idea development and explicitness. These results suggest that CS can serve as a useful strategy for improving certain aspects of writing performance. Nevertheless, its use should be carefully moderated to promote the development of comprehensive writing skills in English. Future research could investigate optimal strategies for incorporating L1 into writing instruction in ways that support, rather than undermine, L2 proficiency.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of the data provides valuable insights into the impact of code-switching on students' paragraph writing performance. The results suggest that code-switching can enhance certain features of writing, particularly Idea Development and Explicitness, where statistically significant differences and moderate practical significance were observed. While the differences in Language and Structure were not statistically significant, the moderate effect sizes highlight the potential benefits of code-switching as a complementary instructional approach. These findings have important implications for second-language writing pedagogy. They suggest that incorporating code-switching into classroom instruction can provide linguistic and cognitive support to students, enabling them to perform better in specific areas of writing.

Therefore, educators should consider integrating code-switching into their writing instruction as a strategy to enhance specific writing features, such as explicitness and idea development. Allowing students to draw on their first language may facilitate clearer expression of complex ideas and improve overall writing quality. In addition, instructors should consider a balance between using L1 and

promoting English proficiency to ensure that students continue to develop their skills in the target language. Furthermore, future research is encouraged to explore the optimal conditions and contexts in which code-switching can be most beneficial for students' writing performance, as well as its impact on other aspects of language acquisition.

REFERENCES

Al-Adnani, A., & Elyas, T. (2016). The Effect of Teacher's Code-Switching on Students' Achievement in Speaking in the EFL Context. European Conference on Language Learning.

Allen, J. R. (2015). The Effects of Explicit Code-Switching Instruction on Student Writing Performance for Students Who Speak Non-Standard Forms of English. Fisher Digital Publications.

Alsamadani, H. (2010). The Relationship between Saudi EFL Students' Writing Competence, LI Writing Proficiency, and Self-regulation". European Journal of Social Sciences, 16(1).

Andrade, M. (2019). The Complexities of Writing: A Review of Research on Writing Challenges in L1 and L2. TESOL Quarterly, 53(2), 567–593.

Arficho, Z. (2013). Training in the Learning Strategies of Writing: Its Effects on Students. In Writing Skills. A PhD Thesis Submitted to the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. Addis Ababa University.

Bakhtiari, S. (2014). The Effects of Mother Tongue Use on Learning Outcomes in English Classrooms. Journal of Language and Education, 5(1), 123–135.

Beressa, K. (2003). Using L1 in the EFL Classroom: The Case of the Oromo Language with Particular Reference to Adama Teachers College. https://etd.aau.edu.et/items/52a37552-c817-4c18-a670-03c88d76d977

Elian, I., Musyarofah, L., & Putranto, H. R. (2023). Perception of EFL students on the use of Indonesian language in English Class. Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature (JELITA, 4(2), 147–159.

Ellis, R. (2019). Collaborative Tasks and Writing Development: Research on Group Writing in Second Language Learning. Language Teaching Research, 23(2), 225–246.

Eshetie, A. B. (2013). Language Policies and the Role of English in Ethiopia. 23rd Annual Conference of IATEFL BESIG, 1–15.

FDRGE. (1994). Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia (FDRE. St.

George Printing Press, Addis Ababa.

Gabayyo, D. (1998). Dawurothuwa Tossaanne Misayuwa Haasaya Amaarathuwa Bilethaana. Waka.

Garza, T., & Nava, E. (2005). Code-switching and Academic Success in Bilingual Classrooms. Bilingual Research Journal, 29(3), 523–540.

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2019). Writing Next: Improving Writing and Reading Instruction in Secondary Schools. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 111(6), 1028–1040.

Greetham, B. (2001). How to Write Better Essays. Palgrave Macmillan.

Guo, L., & Lin, Y. (2021). Context and Culture in Academic Writing: A Chinese Perspective. Asian EFL Journal, 23(3), 145–165.

Habtamu, N. (2013). Exploring the Use of L1 in the EFL Classroom: The Case of Hadiyyisa with Particular Reference to Grade 5 in Some Selected Primary Schools of Hadiya Zone [Addis Ababa University]. https://etd.aau.edu.et/items/c55a1dce-c603-4136-8048-23bb9a0730e1/full

Hinkel, E. (2021). Teaching Academic Writing: Integrating Skills for EFL learners.Routledge.

Hyland, K. (2002). Teaching and Researching Writing. Longman.

Jiang, L., & Hyland, K. (2022). Exploring Writer-Reader Interaction in Academic Discourse: A Meta-Analysis. Journal of Second Language Writing, 58, 100789.

Kern, R. (2000). Literacy and Language Teaching. Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. In R. N.

C. W. E. Rutherford (Ed.), Second Edi. Oxford University Press.

Lee, J. H. (2010). The Differential Effects of Teacher Code-Switching on the Vocabulary Acquisition of Adult and Young EFL Learners: A Study in the Korean Context. http://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:7cce31e4-60f9-4998-95c1-4fa7cef5ad0b

Lee, J. H. (2012). Implications for Language Diversity in Instruction in the Context of Target Language Classrooms: Development of a Preliminary Model of the Effectiveness of Teacher Code-Switching (Vol. 11, Issue 4, pp. 137–160).

Macaro, E. (1997). Target Language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy. In Modern Languages in Practice: 5. UK: Multilingual Matters.

Nation, I. S. P. (2003). The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning.

Asian EFL Journal, 5(2), 1–8.

Nation, I. S. P. (2020). Learning Language through Listening and Reading. Cambridge University Press.

Sahib, R., Mursyid, A. M. M., Kafryawan, W., & Nawing, N. (2021). Code-switching Habits in Group Discussions by Students of English as a Foreign Language. JELITA: Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature, 2(1), 25–37.

Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. K. (2002). Writing. In N. Schmitt (Ed.): An Introduction To Applied Linguistics (pp. 251–266). Arnold.

Simasiku, L., Kasanda, C., & Smit, T. (2015). Can Code Switching Enhance the Learning of the Target Language? Journal of Modern Education Review, 5(6), 564–575. https://doi.org/10.15341/jmer(2155-7993)/06.05.2015/003

Spice, A. (2018). The Effects of Code-Mixing on Second Language Development.

Channels, 3(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.15385/jch.2018.3.1.1

Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative Writing as a Second Language Learning Activity: A Sociocultural Perspective. Journal of Second Language Writing, 48, 56–67.

Teklesellassie, Y., & Boersma, E. (2018). Attitudes towards Code-Switching in an English-Medium Content Classroom. PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand, 55(June), 57–77.

WDC. (2009). Writing Development Centre (WDC). Newcastle University.

Yu, S., & Zhang, Z. (2023). Error Correction in Second Language Writing: Implications for Teaching and Learning. Language Teaching Research, 27(4), 552–571.

Zhang, X., & Liao, M. (2020). Communicating through Writing in Digital Spaces: Perspectives from Chinese University Students. Computers and Composition, 58, 102603.

APPENDICES

Appendix A1: Students' paper correction checklist (Main Rubric)

A. CHECKLIST (for sentence)

4=No errors 3=Few errors 2=Some errors 1=Frequent errors

Element	Items	4	3	2	1
Language	1. Are the words correctly spelt?				
	2. Are the tenses correctly used?				
	3. Are the sentences correctly punctuated?				
	4. Are the ideas expressed in grammatically correct English?				
	5. Are subject-verb agreements maintained?				
	6. Are antecedent-pronoun relations clear?				
Structure	7. Are ideas appropriately joined? (when sentence is compound or complex)				
	8. Are the sentences logically acceptable?				
	9. Do the sentences express complete idea?				
	10. Are the words correctly ordered?				

B. CHECKLIST (for PARAGRAPH)

4=No errors 3=Few errors 2=Some errors 1=Frequent errors

Element	**Items**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Structure	1. Is the introduction clear?				
	2. Are the sections divided into sentences?				
	3 Are the sentences coherently arranged?				
	4. Are the sentences within a paragraph linked smoothly?				
	5. Is there an effective conclusion?				
Idea development	6. Are there enough points in support of the topic sentence?				
	7. Are the claims supported with credible evidence?				
	8. Are the ideas from other sources smoothly connected with the new work?				
Explicitness	9. Are the key concepts clearly defined?				
	10. Are the goals of the paragraph clearly mentioned?				
	11. Are the linking words and phrases effectively used to indicate the relationship between ideas?				
Language	12. Are the ideas expressed in grammatically correct English?				
	13. Are the words correctly spelt?				
	14. Are the tenses correctly used?				
	15. Are the sentences correctly punctuated?				

C. CHECKLST (for ESSAY)

4=No errors 3=Few errors 2=Some errors 1=Frequent errors

Element	Items	4	3	2	1
Structure	1. Is the introduction clear?				
	2. Are the sections divided into paragraphs?				
	3 Are the paragraphs coherently arranged?				
	4. Are the paragraphs within an essay linked smoothly?				
	5. Is there an effective conclusion?				
Idea Development	6. Are there enough points in support of the thesis statement?				
	7. Are the claims supported with credible evidence?				
	8. Are the ideas from other sources smoothly connected with the new work?				
	9. Are the sources correctly cited?				
Explicitness	10. Are the key concepts clearly defined?				
	11. Are the goals of the text clearly mentioned?				
	12. Are the linking words and phrases effectively used to indicate the relationship between ideas?				
Language	13. Are the ideas expressed in grammatically correct English?				
	14. Are the words correctly spelt?				
	15. Are the tenses correctly used?				
	16. Are the sentences correctly punctuated?				

Appendix B1: Interview guide (for teachers)

When teaching English to students majoring in Dawro Doona:

1. Do you switch between English and your students' first language (Dawro Doona)? If so, what are your reasons? If not, why do you avoid code-switching?
2. At which point do your students seem more at ease—when you use code-switching or English only ?
3. In your opinion, which approach—CS or EO—leads to better student performance or achievement?
4. Focusing on writing skills, at which level (sentence, paragraph, or essay) do you believe students gain the most from code-switching?

Appendix C1: Course Syllabus of Advanced Composition in English (EnLa 2071)

Module Title	**English Speaking ,Reading Skills and advanced Writing Skills**					
Course title /code	Advanced Composition in English (EnLa 2071)					
Course credit	5 ECTS					
Course Information	Academic Year II semester I Meeting Day _____ Meeting Time____ Meeting Location____					
Instructor‘s Name						
Instructor‘s Contact	Office =					
ECTS	5CP/ (5x27=135hrs)					
Student Work Load	Lecture	Tutorial	Group Work	Lab practice	Home study	T
	48hrs	12hrs	0	0	75hrs	13
Course Description/content	This course intends to develop the composing skills of students that help them to identify and practice the fundamental techniques of writing skills in higher level, need to develop so that they would become competent and efficient in expressing themselves in writing skills.					
Course objective and competences to be acquired	At the end of the course, students will be able to : *identify the writing skills pertinent to higher level* *-identify the specific function of words in discourses - construct meaningful sentences in English;* *learn to compose a paragraph that has a clearly stated topic sentence and details ;* *use appropriate coordination and subordination skills to relate ideas;* *identify and correct common sentence problems: fragments, Comma splices, and run on sentences, dangling modifiers and agreement errors.* *Compose paragraphs that have clearly stated topic sentences and supporting details.*					
Course status	Compulsory					
week	Course content				Required text	

	1. .Introduction 1. 1. Language skills 1. 2. Problems encounter in paragraph writing 1. 3. Punctuations and capitalization 2 Meaning of paragraph and Paragraph development 2. 1. Meaning of paragraph-Topic sentence, Details, Conclusion 2. 2. Different types of paragraph 2. 2. 1. Description Paragraph 2. 2. 2. Narration Paragraph 2. 2. 3. Argumentative Paragraph 2. 2. 4. Expository Paragraph 2. 3. Qualities of a good paragraph 2. 3. 1. Paragraph unity 2. 3. 2. Coherence and completeness 2. 3. 3. Organizing information in a paragraph 3. Order in Paragraph Writing 3. 1. Chronological Order 3. 2. Spatial Order 3. 3. Order of Importance 3. 4. Order of Familiarity 3.5. Comparison and contrast 4. Writing essays 4. 1 choosing topicsand planning 4. 2. Structure of an essay (Thesis Statement, body, conclusion) 4. 3. Types of composition /essay/ 4. 3. 1. Descriptive composition /essay/ 4. 3. 2. Narrative composition /essay 4. 3. 3 Expository exposition /essay/ 4. 3. 4. Argumentative composition /essay/ 5. Methods of quoting peoples 5. 1. Adapting to one‘s own word 5. 2. Quoting as it is 5. 3. Adapting by summarizing	A concise Guide Composition Page 28-32 Academic writing skills 53-70 Essential Guide to writi ng Page 19-34 College writing skills Page 31-33 Academic writing Page 45-48 Essential Guide to writi ng Page 67-73 Writing 53-70 Essential Guide to Page 45-67 Academic writing skills The oxford Essential Guide to writing 87-106 College writing skills The oxford Guide to wri ting 351-365
Teaching and learning methods: *Lecture, group work, interactive tutorial sessions (group and pair work/discussions and individual work (independent learning).*		

Assessment Students are most frequently evaluated through their written assignments (40%) There is also final exam (40%)	Continuous assessment Two individual writing assignments 30% Assignment 1 Sentence level writing (10%) Assignment 2 Paragraph writing (20 %) Two group writing assignments 30% Assignment 1 paragraph level writing (10%) Assignment 2 Essay level writing (20 %) Final Exam 40%.	Competence to be assessed Skill and knowledge of: *identifying components of a sentence, completing a sentence with appropriate components, identifying types of sentence, identifying elements of a paragraph, Writing a topic sentence and supporting sentence* writing descriptive, expository, narrative and argumentative paragraph writing an essay (outlining, drafting, revising, editing).
Course Expectation	**Preparedness**: you must come to class prepared by bringing with you the appropriate materials like the worksheet, text books and completed assignments. Complete the reading assignments and other activities on time. You must plan your own learning. Since the course is a writing course, it is demanding, and you are expected to work much individually to meet the requirement of the course. You have to use your time for group work and home study effectively. **Participation**: make active participation during discussions (you must participate in class).	

Course Policy	**Attendance:** It is compulsory to attend every class session on time. If you anticipate missing more than four classes during the term, you are advised not to enroll in this course. **Assignments:** All assignments must be completed and submitted on time. **Tests/Quizzes:** Short quizzes and tests will be administered almost every week. If you are absent or late to class, you will forfeit the opportunity to take the quiz or test. No make-up tests or quizzes will be given. Students are expected to comply with the university's rules and regulations. **Cheating/Plagiarism:** You are required to complete your own work independently and must not copy or obtain answers from others. Learning English effectively requires personal effort. In addition, please refrain from eating, using recorders or CD players, wearing sunglasses, or discussing personal matters during class. Ensure that all pagers and mobile phones are turned off before entering the classroom or examination sessions.

References	Coe, N., Robin, R., & Pauline, E. (1983). *The Writing Skills: A Problem Solving Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Emory, D. (1995). *Improve Your Essay: Form A*. New York: Glencoe. Folse, M. K., et al. (1999). *Great Essays*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. Forsyth, S., & Hutchinson, L. (1981). *Practical Composition*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. Fowler, W. S. (1989). *Progressive Writing Skills*. London: Longman Ltd. Gehle, L. Q., & Duncan, J. R. (1977). *The Writing Process*. New York: St. Martin's Press. Johnston, T., & James, G. (1987). *The Writers Advice Book*. Massachusetts: Ginn Press. Lunsford, A., & Conners, R. (1989). *The St. Martin's Handbook*. New York: St. Martin's Press. Timmer, J. (2001). *Writing with Purpose* (13th ed.). New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. _____ (1983). *Nucleus: English for Science and Technology (General Science)*. London: Longman Press. Brown, G. (1977). *Listening to Spoken English*. New York: Longman. Thorne, S. (1997). *Mastering Advanced English Language*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd. Tillit, B. (1985). *Speaking Naturally*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Underwood, M. (1989). *Teaching Listening*. New York: Longman. Verderber, R. (1987). *Communicate*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company. _____ (1985). *The Challenge of Effective Speaking*. California.
Approval sheet Instructor‘s name _____ Signature _____ Module coordinator‘s name _____ Signature _____ Program coordinator‘s name_____ Signature_____	

Appendix D1: Class schedule

Class schedule and course offering for Department of Dawuro language and literature 3rd year 2nd semester 2016 academic year

no	Course code	Course name	CHr	Instructor	Time(Local time)	Way of delivery	Remark
1	Dala-M3032	English Grammar in Use	3/5	TBA	Wednesday 4:00-5:00 Friday 4:00-6:00	semester	
2	Dala-M3062	Media Laws and Ethics	3/5	Mr. A	Monday 4:00-6:00 Friday 8:30-9:30	semester	
3	Dala-M3102	Research Methods and report writings	3/5	Mr. B	Wednesday 2:00-4:00 Friday 9:30-10:30	semester	
4	Dala-M3012	Listening Skills	3/5	Mr. C	Tuesday 4:00-6:00 Thursday 5:00-6:00	semester	
5	EnLa-2071	Advanced Composition in English	3/5	Mr. D	Monday 2:00-4:00 Tuesday 9:30-10:30 Wednesday 8:30-10:30 Thursday 2:00-4:00	Group 1	Block 1 (eight weeks)
					Monday 9:30-10:30 Tuesday 2:00-4:00 Thursday 8:30-10:30 Friday 2:00-4:00	Group 2	
6	Dala-M3052	Survey of African literature	3/5	Mr. E		Block 2	Second block

Appendix E1: List of Participant Students

Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha campus
Department of Dawro Language and Literature
Course: Advanced Composition in English (EnLa 2071)

S.no	Id Number	Gender	Class Year	Group
1	SSc/R/004/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
2	SSc/R/005/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
3	SSc/R/019/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
4	SSc/R/021/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
5	SSc/R/023/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
6	SSc/R/027/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
7	SSc/R/034/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
8	SSc/R/035/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
9	SSc/R/042/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
10	SSc/R/048/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
11	SSc/R/050/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
12	SSc/R/054/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
13	SSc/R/055/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
14	SSc/R/057/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
15	SSc/R/058/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
16	SSc/R/079/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
17	SSc/R/090/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
18	SSc/R/093/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
19	SSc/R/108/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
20	SSc/R/111/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
21	SSc/R/117/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
22	SSc/R/125/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
23	SSc/R/137/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
24	SSc/R/138/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
25	SSc/R/140/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
26	SSc/R/142/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
27	SSc/R/144/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
28	SSc/R/160/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
29	SSc/R/161/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
30	SSc/R/166/13	Female	3rd Year	Section 1
31	SSc/R/168/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
32	SSc/R/178/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1
33	SSc/R/180/13	Male	3rd Year	Section 1

Appendix F1: Consent Form for Research Participants

Title of the Study:

Examining the Effect of Teacher's Code-Switching on Students' Writing Performance in English Language Classroom: the Case of Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha Campus, Ethiopia

Researcher:

Markos Medhin (Adds Ababa University, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature)

Phone number: 0913341941

Introduction:

You are invited to participate in a research study that investigates how code-switching (alternating between two languages) may affect students' writing performance in English. Please read the following information carefully before deciding whether or not to take part.

Purpose of the Study:

The purpose of this study is to explore whether the use of code-switching in English language instruction influences students' writing skills and overall writing performance.

Procedures:

If you agree to participate, you will:

- Attend regular English language classes where code-switching may be used as part of instruction.
- Provide samples of your written work during the study period.
- Possibly take part in a brief interview or questionnaire about your learning experience.

Voluntary Participation:

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may choose not to participate or to withdraw at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits. Your academic standing or classroom evaluation will not be affected.

Risks and Benefits:

There are no known risks associated with this study. While you may not receive any direct benefit, your participation will help contribute to research in language teaching and learning.

Confidentiality:

All information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. Your name will not be used in any reports or publications. Data will be stored securely and only accessible to the researcher.

Contact Information:

If you have any questions about the study, you may contact:

1. Researcher:

Markos Medhin - Phone number 0913341941; email: markofmedan@gmail.com

2. Supervisor:

Dr. Nuru Mohammed - Phone number 0911226886; email: nurumt@gmail.com

Consent Statement:

I have read and understood the information provided above. I agree to voluntarily participate in this study. I understand that I can withdraw at any time without penalty.

Participant's Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Researcher's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix G1: Pretest (main study)

Dear student, this test is prepared to know your present level of writing performance. The test has 7 parts. Read the instructions under each section carefully and answer the questions accordingly.

Time allotted to complete the test is **two** hours.

Id.No.:_____ Age: _____Sex: _____

I. Rewrite the following jumbled words in their correct order to make a meaningful sentence. (1 point each)

1. entire/where/ the/school/ is/ place/ you/ your/lay/ base/ for/ life.

_____

2. your/ good/ what/ can /do /you/ to /community /thing?

_____

3. those/ work/ may/ who/ hard/ goals /achieve/ their.

_____

II. Choose the most suitable cohesive device from the following box and write on the blank spaces to complete the sentences. (1 point each)

if	for example	because	moreover	however

1. I support the argument "population Matters" **_____** I think that if we keep on growing, we are not only going to damage nature but also we are likely to see more and more inequality and human suffering.

2. The human population can no longer be allowed to grow in the same uncontrolled traditional way. **_____** we do not take charge of our population size, then nature will do it for us.

3. To reduce the growth of population, humanity can take different measures. _____, reducing the unplanned consumptions of natural resources and implementing family planning are among others.

4. Educating and empowering women and girls and providing family planning information enable more people to choose the size of their families; _____, governments have to produce clear policies that enable to address the biodiversity loss we are facing.

5. Adding more people to our planet causes a large number of problems; _____, people are also of great responsibility to solve these problems.

III. Underline the topic sentence, the sentence that expresses the paragraph's main idea, in each paragraph. (1 point each)

The weather in March was unpredictable. One day there was heavy ground fog, and the next day was clear. It rained for a few days and cleared up and then it rained again. One day the temperature ranged from 45 degrees to 75 degrees, and the next day the temperature stayed around 55 degrees all day long. It was difficult to plan activities or know what to wear with such un- predictable weather.

There are many reasons why people go to football games. Some of the fans go to games because they feel it would help their team to win the series. Others consider going to football games is more exciting than watching them on TV. A few think that purchasing tickets to football games would ensure the financial success of the game and, thus, its continuance. And a very small number explain that going to football games is strictly a social occasion.

IV. In the following paragraphs the important specific details that develop the topic sentence of the paragraphs are presented. However, the topic sentence that opens each of the paragraphs is missing. Write the topic sentence. (2 points each)

1. _____. He brings his wife roses at least once a week, and he likes to give them to express his love to her, and she always loves to get them. He is honest and he spends his leisure time with her. He doesn't smoke, nor does he drink. Since he

comes home in time, he doesn't worry his wife waiting for a long time through the night. He helps his wife in the house works. Even when she prepares food in the kitchen, he makes her take rest and he himself prepares the food.

2. _____. At parties he sits in a corner by himself all night. When he is in a crowd, you would never notice him. When you talk to him, he looks at the ground and stammers out one-word replies. He never speaks in class, and I've never seen him talk to a girl. He is reluctant to attend meetings where many people are present.

V. The following sentences are not in correct order. If you correctly order them, they make a meaningful paragraph. Reorder them to maintain the continuity or logical flow of the paragraph. (1 point each)

A. **S**wim out and approach the victim from behind in order to avoid struggling.
B. Then go to the special procedure called a "carry", and swim back to shore with the victim.
C. In order to save a drowning person, you must jump in to the water, keeping your eye on the victim all the times.
D. Bring the victim into a horizontal position by pulling back on the chin and resting the body on your hip, using your arms as a lever.
E. Stick your elbow in the middle of the victim's back and cup the chin with your hand.

The right order is: _____, ____, _____, ____, _____

VI. Hereunder are four paragraphs. They are not in correct order. Re-arrange the jumbled paragraphs to form a coherent essay. (1 point each)

1. A further reason for completing a college degree is that the knowledge you get from college makes your life more pleasurable. For example, if you take introduction to music history, you become familiar with the different musical periods and styles. You start to enjoy the classical music that you listen to, because now you understand more about it. When you study literature, you get a better understanding of the beauty of poetry. You will notice that college subjects not only make you more knowledgeable; they bring more pleasure to your life.

2. College degrees are becoming more and more common. Twenty years ago, most people (if they were lucky) had only a high school certificate, and that was enough to get them a job. Some people now

believe that college degrees are so common that they are not so important anymore. What counts is the experience that a person has for a job. However, I believe that, even though college degrees are more common these days, they are still important and worth the effort.

3. A final reason for getting a college degree is that it shapes your character. In order to be successful in college, you need to learn to manage your time. You also need to be responsible and work hard, do all your assignments and study well for all your tests. In addition, you learn to deal with frustrations, such as low grades or tiredness. You learn to persevere and keep trying. This is very good training for the frustrations you will have in your job and in your life later on.

4. One important reason for getting a college degree is that a college degree gives you the basic information and preparation that you need to get a good job. College courses are organized so that you can get the information you need about a certain job. College courses teach you skills for that job. Of course, college courses cannot teach you everything you need to know, but they give you the basics, enough information for you to be prepared. They also teach you how you can get the information that you don't have. Therefore, in order to get a good job preparation, it is a good idea to complete a college degree

The right order is: _____, _____, _____, ____

VII. An <u>essay</u> is a series of paragraphs which is written on a certain topic. An essay can be composed of an introductory paragraph, a paragraph that introduces the main idea(s) of the essay, body paragraphs, two or more paragraphs which develop or elaborate the ideas of the essay, and a concluding paragraph, which concludes the essay. Now write a short essay <u>about yourself</u>. (7 points)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix H1: Student grouping based on pretest result (main study)

Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha campus
Department of Dawro Language and Literature
Course: Advanced Composition in English (EnLa 2071)
Year 3

SN	ID Number	Gender	pretest=30%	Group
1	SSc/R/050/13	Male	21	Control
2	SSc/R/168/13	Male	20	Experimental
3	SSc/R/108/13	Female	17	Control
4	SSc/R/160/13	Male	17	Experimental
5	SSc/R/004/13	Male	16.5	Control
6	SSc/R/180/13	Male	16.5	Experimental
7	SSc/R/035/13	Female	16	Control
8	SSc/R/048/13	Male	16	Experimental
9	SSc/R/005/13	Female	15	Control
10	SSc/R/019/13	Male	15	Experimental
11	SSc/R/042/13	Female	15	Control
12	SSc/R/090/13	Female	15	Experimental
13	SSc/R/144/13	Male	14.5	Control
14	SSc/R/034/13	Female	14	Experimental
15	SSc/R/093/13	Male	13	Control
16	SSc/R/117/13	Female	13	Experimental
17	SSc/R/021/13	Male	12	Control
18	SSc/R/055/13	Male	12	Experimental
19	SSc/R/057/13	Female	12	Control
20	SSc/R/140/13	Male	12	Experimental
21	SSc/R/142/13	Female	12	Control
22	SSc/R/161/13	Male	12	Experimental
23	SSc/R/023/13	Female	11.5	Control
24	SSc/R/178/13	Male	11.5	Experimental
25	SSc/R/058/13	Male	10.5	Control
26	SSc/R/054/13	Female	9	Experimental
27	SSc/R/125/13	Female	9	Control
28	SSc/R/138/13	Female	9	Experimental
29	SSc/R/079/13	Female	8	Control
30	SSc/R/137/13	Female	8	Experimental
31	SSc/R/166/13	Female	8	Control
32	SSc/R/027/13	Male	6	Experimental
33	SSc/R/111/13	Male	6	Control

Appendix I1: Participant students sorted by ID number

ID number	Sex	Pretest result	Group (1=EO; 2=CS)
SSc/R/004/13	Male	16.5	1
SSc/R/005/13	Female	15	1
SSc/R/021/13	Male	12	1
SSc/R/023/13	Female	11.5	1
SSc/R/035/13	Female	16	1
SSc/R/042/13	Female	15	1
SSc/R/050/13	Male	21	1
SSc/R/057/13	Female	12	1
SSc/R/058/13	Male	10.5	1
SSc/R/079/13	Female	8	1
SSc/R/093/13	Male	13	1
SSc/R/108/13	Female	17	1
SSc/R/111/13	Male	6	1
SSc/R/125/13	Female	9	1
SSc/R/142/13	Female	12	1
SSc/R/144/13	Male	14.5	1
SSc/R/166/13	Female	8	1
SSc/R/019/13	Male	15	2
SSc/R/027/13	Male	6	2
SSc/R/034/13	Female	14	2
SSc/R/048/13	Male	16	2
SSc/R/054/13	Female	9	2
SSc/R/055/13	Male	12	2
SSc/R/090/13	Female	15	2
SSc/R/117/13	Female	13	2
SSc/R/137/13	Female	8	2
SSc/R/138/13	Female	9	2
SSc/R/140/13	Male	12	2
SSc/R/160/13	Male	17	2
SSc/R/161/13	Male	12	2
SSc/R/168/13	Male	18	2
SSc/R/178/13	Male	11.5	2
SSc/R/180/13	Male	16.5	2

Appendix J1: Posttest (main study)

I. Rewrite the following jumbled words in their correct order to make a meaningful sentence.

1. country/ your/ love/ to/ your/ is/ action/ manifested/ by/ your

_____

2. helps/ God/ those/ who/ help/ themselves.

_____

3. contributed/ have/ you/ ever/ something/ community/ meaningful/ to/ your?

_____

4. respect / shows / how / you / others / your / character

_____

5. always / should / we / truth / the / speak

_____

6. pollution / to / solution / a / be / can / awareness / raising

_____

II. Choose the most suitable cohesive device from the following box and write on the blank spaces to complete the sentences. (1 point each)

because	for example	however	if	moreover

1. Overpopulation is a serious issue that affects the environment; _____, it leads to deforestation and pollution in many regions.
2. _____ we do not act now to control our use of resources, future generations may face severe shortages.
3. Increasing access to education plays a major role in population control. _____, when people are educated, they make informed decisions about family size.
4. The government should invest in public awareness campaigns about overpopulation; _____, it must also ensure healthcare systems support reproductive health.
5. Many people do not realize the urgency of the population crisis. _____, they continue to use resources irresponsibly.

III. Underline the topic sentence, the sentence that expresses the paragraph's main idea, in each paragraph. (1 point each)

1. In Arab countries men commonly cut in front of women at ticket window. In Britain and the United States, where “first come, first served” is almost a norm, customers take numbers to ensure that “first come” is really “first served.” By contrast, in southern Europe, where people don’t like businesses regulating their behavior, lines are disorderly, with lots of pushing and shoving for the best position; the strongest or most aggressive win. This shows that the way people wait in line reflects cultural values about fairness.
2. The sidewalks in our neighborhood are dirty. A muddy layer has been left on the concrete. Garbage is piled up because of the collectors' strike. Packs of dogs have left their waste everywhere. Old newspapers carpet the sidewalks, and neighborhood drunks have left their bottles piled against the buildings. You can't walk anywhere without stepping on something.

IV. In the following paragraphs the important specific details that develop the topic sentence of the paragraphs are presented. However, the topic sentence that opens each of the paragraphs is missing. Write the topic sentence. (2 points each)

1. _____. Coal can be used as a source of energy. It can be consumed directly, as in heaters of homes and factories, or it can be converted into oil for automobiles, diesel locomotives, and airplanes. Coal is cheap as well as abundant, and all the technology necessary for extracting or converting it already exists. Exploiting coal recourses would make us totally independent of the producing nations for generations to come.
2. _____. Her large, dark eyes are beautiful. Her complexion is flawless, and she has a lovely big smile. Her long, black hair is full and shiny. She is tall and slender, and her every movement is graceful. She also dresses stylishly, and her assortment of passant skirts and loose- fitting blouses look great on her.

V. The following sentences are not in correct order. If you correctly order them, they make a meaningful paragraph. Reorder them to maintain the continuity or logical flow of the paragraph. (1 point each)

1. In 1999,Addis Ababa university awarded Haddis on honorary Doctorate.
2. He attended several schools in Addis Ababa.
3. Haddis subsequently published several other novels in Amharic.
4. In the *1965,* he published Fikir Eskemekaber, his most famous novel.
5. One of the famous Ethiopian authors, Haddis Alemayehti was born in 1910.

The right order is: ____, ____, ____, ____, _____

VI. Hereunder are five paragraphs. They are not in correct order. Re-arrange the jumbled paragraphs to form a coherent essay. (1 point each)

1. Back in his garden, first of all, Larry used a rope to tie a chair to his car door. Next, he tied the balloons to the chair and inflated them, one by one. Then, he packed a few sandwiches and a bottle of Coke, loaded an air-pistol, and climbed on to the chair. His plan was to float up lazily into the sky to about sixty meters, and then to pop a few balloons descend to earth again.

2. His preparations complete, Larry cut the rope. By this time, he didn't float up, he shot up, as if he had been fired from a cannon! Not to sixty meters, but up and up and up, until about 3, 500 meters. If he had popped any balloons at this height, he would have plummeted to earth. Fortunately, just at that moment he just had to stay up there, floating around and wondering what to do.

3. Larry Waiters was a truck driver, but his lifetime dream was to fly airplanes. Then one day, he would watch the fighter jets criss-crossing the skies above his back garden and dream about the magic of flying. Eventually, he had an idea. He drove to the nearest hardware shop and bought twenty large balloons and five tanks of helium. Unfortunately, they were not normal brightly colored party balloons but heavy one-meter weather balloons used by meteorologists.

4. As soon as he was on the ground he was arrested. A TV reporter shouted, 'Hey man, why did you do it" Larry looked him in the eye, and said, 'A man's got to follow his dreams'.

5. However, night was falling and things were getting serious. Winds were blowing Larry out to the sea. By this time an amazed British Airways pilot spotted him and radioed the airport saying he'd just seen a man with a gun, sitting on a garden chair at 3,500 meters. Immediately a helicopter was sent to rescue him, but it wasn't easy because the wind from their rotor blades kept pushing the home-made airship further away. Fortunately, they managed to drop a line down from above, and pulled him to safety.

The right order is: _____, _____, _____, ____, ____

VII. An <u>essay</u> is a series of paragraphs which is written on a certain topic. An essay can be composed of an introductory paragraph - a paragraph that introduces the main idea(s) of the essay, body paragraphs - two or more paragraphs which develop or elaborate the ideas of the essay, and a concluding paragraph which concludes the essay. Now write a short essay about your future plan (7 points)

<u>My future plan</u>

Appendix K1: A classroom audio 1 transcribed (EO)

Date: January 22, 2024

Place: Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha Campus (in the campus)

Class time: Monday 8:00-10:00 AM

Period duration: 2 hours

Hello, everyone! Welcome to today's class. How are you all doing? …..

Today, we are going to talk about an important part of writing: types of paragraphs. This will help you organize your ideas and improve your writing skills for essays, assignments, and exams.

Let me start with a question: What is a paragraph? Can anyone tell me? [Pause for student responses. Encourage them to share ideas, even if short or basic.]

Great! A paragraph is a group of sentences that focus on one idea. Think of it as a small part of a bigger picture, like a building block in an essay.

In today's class, we will:

Learn about four main types of paragraphs.

Understand how to write each type.

Practice identifying and creating these paragraphs.

Let's begin!

Section 1: What is a Paragraph?

Before we discuss the types of paragraphs, let's quickly review what makes a paragraph.

Every paragraph has three key parts:

A Topic Sentence – This is the first sentence. It tells the reader the main idea of the paragraph.

Supporting Sentences – These sentences give more information about the main idea. They include examples, details, or explanations.

A Concluding Sentence – This sentence summarizes the paragraph or links to the next paragraph.

Let's see an example: (example paragraph is displayed via projector)

Reading books is one of my favorite hobbies. It helps me relax after a long day and improves my vocabulary. For example, I recently read a book about history that taught me many new words. Reading is a great way to learn and enjoy at the same time.

The topic sentence is: 'Reading books is one of my favorite hobbies.'

The supporting sentences explain why and give an example.

The concluding sentence is: ‘Reading is a great way to learn and enjoy at the same time.’

…..

Can someone tell me what the topic sentence in this paragraph is?…..

What is the purpose of the concluding sentence? ….

Great! Now, let’s move on to the different types of paragraphs."

Section 2: Types of Paragraphs

"There are four main types of paragraphs in English writing. They are:

Narrative Paragraphs

Descriptive Paragraphs

Expository Paragraphs

Persuasive Paragraphs

Let’s look at each one in detail."

1. Narrative Paragraphs

A narrative paragraph tells a story or describes an event in time order. Think of it as answering the question: What happened?

For example: (example paragraph is displayed via projector)

Last weekend, I went to the beach with my friends. We played volleyball, swam in the sea, and enjoyed the warm sunshine. After that, we ate ice cream and watched the sunset. It was a perfect day.'

Notice that this paragraph describes what happened step by step. It uses time-order words like 'last weekend,' 'after that,' and 'then.'

…..

What is the main purpose of a narrative paragraph? ….

Can you think of a story you could write in a narrative paragraph?….

2. Descriptive Paragraphs

A descriptive paragraph paints a picture with words. It focuses on describing something using details and senses: sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch.

For example: (example paragraph is displayed via projector)

The garden was full of blooming flowers. Red roses stood tall in the sunlight, while the soft fragrance of lavender filled the air. Bees buzzed around, and the gentle rustling of leaves created a peaceful sound. It felt like a magical place.

Did you notice the sensory details? You can see the flowers, smell the lavender, and hear the rustling leaves.

…..

What is the goal of a descriptive paragraph? …

Can someone describe their favorite place using sensory details? Just one or two sentences. …

3. Expository Paragraphs

An expository paragraph explains or gives information about a topic. It answers questions like How? or Why?

For example: (example paragraph is displayed via projector)

Photosynthesis is the process by which plants make food. During photosynthesis, plants use sunlight, carbon dioxide, and water to produce oxygen and glucose. This process is essential for life on Earth because it provides oxygen for humans and animals to breathe.

Notice how this paragraph gives facts and explains a process. There is no story or opinion here – just information.

….

What kind of information do we include in an expository paragraph? …

Can someone give me an example of a topic for an expository paragraph? ….

4. Persuasive Paragraphs

A persuasive paragraph tries to convince the reader of something. It answers the question: Why should I agree with you?

For example: (example paragraph is displayed via projector)

Schools should have more outdoor activities. Outdoor activities help students stay healthy, improve their teamwork skills, and reduce stress. Research shows that students who spend time outdoors perform better academically. Therefore, schools should include outdoor activities in their daily schedules.

Notice how the paragraph makes an argument and supports it with reasons and evidence.

……

What is the goal of a persuasive paragraph? …

Can you think of a topic you feel strongly about? What would you argue for? ….

Section 3: Practice and Review

Now, let’s practice! I will give you a few topics. Your job is to decide which type of paragraph fits the topic best.

….. (He wrote these on the board)

"Now it’s your turn to practice. I will give you a few topics. You will tell me which type of paragraph fits the topic best. Ready?

Describe your favorite meal. [Pause – students should answer: Descriptive.]

Explain how to study for an exam. [Pause – students should answer: Expository.]

Tell me about your last holiday. [Pause – students should answer: Narrative.]

Convince your friend to adopt a pet. [Pause – students should answer: Persuasive.]

Great job! Now, I want you to pick one of these topics and write a short paragraph. You have 20 minutes. Don’t worry about mistakes – just focus on writing!"

[Pause for students to write. Walk around, provide help, and encourage them.]

"Let’s recap what we learned today:

Narrative paragraphs tell a story.

Descriptive paragraphs use sensory details.

Expository paragraphs explain or give information.

Persuasive paragraphs argue a point.

…..

"What type of paragraph do you find easiest to write? Which one is most challenging?"

[Encourage sharing.]

Remember, writing is a skill that improves with practice. The more you write, the better you’ll get! Thank you for participating today. See you in the next class!"

Appendix L1: A classroom audio 2 transcribed (CS)

Date: January 23, 2024

Place: Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha Campus (in the campus)

Class time: Tuesday 8:00-10:00 AM

Period duration: 2 hours

"Hello, everyone! How's everyone doing today? …..Today, we're going to talk about a very important topic in writing: Types of Paragraphs.

Let me ask you a question:

Paragraafii ayee? …. That's right! A paragraph is a group of sentences that talk about one idea. In English, a paragraph helps to organize your writing and make it easier to understand.

By the end of today's class, you will:

- Understand the four main types of paragraphs.
- Learn how to write each one.
- Practice identifying and writing different paragraphs.

Let's get started!"

Section 1: What is a Paragraph?

"First, let's review what makes a paragraph. A paragraph has three main parts:

The Topic Sentence (Huup'e yafara) – This is the first sentence. It tells the reader the main idea. For example: 'My favorite hobby is playing soccer.'

Supporting Sentences (*zeriya yafaratuwa*) – These sentences explain or give examples of the main idea. They add details.

The Concluding Sentence (*Yiiciya yafara*) – This sentence summarizes the paragraph or connects it to the next idea.

For example, let's look at this paragraph (example paragraph is displayed via projector)

'I love playing soccer. It helps me stay healthy, and I enjoy spending time with my friends on the field. We play every weekend, and it's always fun. Soccer is my favorite way to relax and exercise.'

The topic sentence (huup'e yafaray) is: 'I love playing soccer.'

The supporting sentences give reasons and examples.

The concluding sentence (Yiic'iya yafaray) is: 'Soccer is my favorite way to relax and exercise.'

Pause:

What is the topic sentence?" [Wait for responses.]

"Why is the concluding sentence important? Can anyone tell me?"

Good! Now, let’s move on to the different types of paragraphs."

Section 2: Types of Paragraphs

"There are four main types of paragraphs that we use in English writing:

- Narrative Paragraphs (*Tossaa odiya paragraafiya*)
- Descriptive Paragraphs (*biddi besiya paragraafiya*)
- Expository Paragraphs (*Qoncissiya paragraafiya*)
- Persuasive Paragraphs (*paluma paragraafiya*)

Let’s take a closer look at each one."

1. Narrative Paragraphs

"A narrative paragraph tells a story. It answers the question: What happened?

For example - (example paragraph is displayed via projector)

'Last summer, I went to the beach with my family. We swam in the ocean, built sandcastles, and ate ice cream. In the evening, we watched the sunset together. It was a day I’ll never forget.'

Notice that this paragraph tells a story in time order. It uses words like 'last summer,' 'then,' and 'in the evening.'

Pause …

Narrative Paragraafii aye? What does a narrative paragraph do?" [Wait for answers.]

"Can you tell me a short story in one or two sentences? Maybe about your weekend?" Students participate

2. Descriptive Paragraphs

"A descriptive paragraph paints a picture with words. It focuses on describing a person, place, or thing using sensory details: what you see, hear, smell, taste, or touch.

For example (example paragraph is displayed via projector)

'The garden was full of colorful flowers. The roses were bright red, and the air smelled fresh and sweet. Birds were singing, and the soft breeze made the leaves rustle gently. It was a peaceful and beautiful place.'

Pause …

"Descriptive paragraafii aye? What kind of details do we use?"

Wait for responses:

"Can someone describe a place they like? What does it look like? What can you hear there?" [Encourage answers.]

3. Expository Paragraphs

"An expository paragraph explains something. It answers questions like How? or Why?. Think of it as teaching the reader about a topic.

For example - (example paragraph is displayed via projector)

'Photosynthesis is the process by which plants make food. Plants use sunlight, water, and carbon dioxide to produce oxygen and glucose. This process is important because it gives us oxygen to breathe and helps plants grow.'

Notice that this paragraph gives information and facts. It does not tell a story or describe something.

Pause and Check:

“Expository paragraafii aya odanaw xaafettii? What is the purpose of an expository paragraph?" [Wait for answers.]

"Can someone give me an example of a topic you can explain? For example, how to cook something or how something works?"

4. Persuasive Paragraphs

"A persuasive paragraph tries to convince the reader to agree with your opinion. It answers the question: Why should I agree with you?

For example (example paragraph is displayed via projector)

'Students should have less homework. Too much homework causes stress and leaves little time for hobbies and family. Studies show that students who have a balance between school and free time perform better. Therefore, teachers should reduce the amount of homework they give.'

Notice that this paragraph gives reasons and evidence to support the writer’s opinion.

Pause and Check:

"What is the goal of a persuasive paragraph? Why do we write it?" [Wait for answers.]

"Can you think of a topic you feel strongly about? What would you argue for or against?"

Section 3: Practice and Review

"Now it’s your turn to practice. I will give you a few topics. You will tell me which type of paragraph fits the topic best. Ready?

Describe your favorite meal. [Pause – students answer: Descriptive.]

Explain how to study for an exam. [Pause – students answer: Expository.]

Tell me about your last holiday. [Pause – students answer: Narrative.]

Convince your friend to adopt a pet. [Pause – students answer: Persuasive.]

Great! Now, let's write. I want you to choose one of these topics and write a short paragraph. Use the type of paragraph that fits the topic. You have 20 minutes."

[Pause while students write. Walk around the class and help as needed.]

"Let's quickly review what we learned today.

A narrative paragraph tells a story.

A descriptive paragraph uses sensory details to paint a picture.

An expository paragraph explains or gives information.

A persuasive paragraph argues a point and tries to convince the reader.

Pause and Ask:

"Which type of paragraph do you think is easiest to write? Which one is hardest?" [Encourage discussion.]

Remember, practice makes perfect. Writing paragraphs will help you become better at organizing your ideas in English. Thank you for your participation today – see you next class!"

Appendix M1: A classroom audio 3 transcribed (EO)

Date: January 31, 2024

Place: Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha Campus (in the campus)

Class time: Wednesday 2:30-4:30 PM

Period duration: 2 hours

Good afternoon, everyone! Today, we are going to focus on a very important part of academic writing: essay writing. By the end of this lesson, you will know how to structure an essay, develop your ideas, and improve your overall writing skills.

…

Let me ask you first: How many of you have written essays in English before? Raise your hands. (*Pause for responses*)

Great! And how many of you find it difficult to write essays? It's okay, don't worry. Today, we'll work through it step by step.

So, we're learning how to write essays—how to structure them and how to make them clear and effective. I'll make sure to guide you through it all.

Why do you think essays are important in university? Take a moment to think.

...

Exactly! Essays help us express our ideas, explain topics, and show our understanding.

1: What is an Essay?

Let's start with the basics: What is an essay? An essay is a piece of writing where you share your ideas about a topic. It has a clear purpose and a formal structure.

An essay is formal. It is organized. And it focuses on one main idea.

Let me give you an example: If you are asked to write about climate change, your essay could explain what climate change is, why it's happening, and how we can stop it.

Does this make sense so far? Raise your hand if you understand what an essay is.

…

2: Structure of an Essay

Now that we know what an essay is, let's talk about its structure. An essay has three main parts: The Introduction, The Body, The Conclusion.

Introduction

"The introduction is the first paragraph of your essay. It has three parts:

A hook to grab the reader's attention,
Background information to explain the topic,
A thesis statement to tell the reader your main idea
Example:
If your essay is about the benefits of exercise, your introduction might look like this:
The hook: 'Exercise is the secret to a longer and healthier life.'
Background: 'Today, many people struggle to find time for exercise due to busy schedules.'
Thesis: 'This essay will explain the physical, mental, and social benefits of regular exercise.'"
So, remember, the introduction has three parts: the hook, the background, and the thesis statement. Repeat after me: hook, background, thesis statement.
Can someone tell me, what is a hook? Yes, it's the sentence that grabs attention. And what is the thesis statement? Good—it's the main idea of the essay!
Body
The body is the longest part of the essay. This is where you explain your main points in detail.
Each paragraph in the body should have:
A topic sentence,
Supporting details or examples, and
A concluding sentence to wrap up the paragraph
Example:
In an essay about exercise, one body paragraph could be:
Topic sentence: 'Exercise improves physical health by strengthening muscles and improving heart function.'
Supporting details: Include facts or examples, like 'Regular exercise reduces the risk of heart disease.'
Concluding sentence: 'Therefore, regular exercise is essential for physical health.'
Does everyone understand the structure of a body paragraph? Raise your hand if you do.
…
Great! Remember: one main idea per paragraph.
Conclusion
The conclusion is the last paragraph of your essay. It has two parts:
A summary of your main points,

A final thought to leave an impression on the reader.

Example:

In the conclusion of the exercise essay, you could write:

‘In conclusion, regular exercise improves physical, mental, and social well-being. Everyone should make time for exercise in their daily lives.’

What do you think makes a good final thought? Yes, it should be clear and memorable.

3. Tips for Writing an Essay

Now that we understand the structure, let’s talk about some tips to help you write better essays.

Tip 1: Plan Before You Write

Before you start writing, take time to plan. Think about your topic and brainstorm your ideas. Write a quick outline with the introduction, body, and conclusion.

How many of you usually plan before you write? Try it—it will make your essay more organized.

Tip 2: Use Transition Words

Use transition words to connect your ideas. Words like ‘however,’ ‘therefore,’ and ‘for example’ make your essay flow better.

Example:

‘Exercise improves physical health. However, it also has mental health benefits.’ See how the transition connects the two ideas?

So, transition words help connect ideas. They make your writing smoother.

Tip 3: Edit and Check for Errors

After writing, always check your essay for grammar, spelling, and punctuation mistakes. Even small errors can make a big difference.

Do you usually check your work before submitting? It’s a good habit!

Now, let’s practice! I’ll give you a simple essay topic:

‘The benefits of learning English.’

Write an introduction for this essay. Remember to include a hook, background, and thesis statement. You have 20 minutes. Start now!

…

Time’s up! Would anyone like to share their introduction? Let’s review it together.

…

Let’s quickly review what we learned today.

An essay has three parts: introduction, body, conclusion.

Each part has its own structure.

Good essays are planned, organized, and carefully checked for mistakes.

I encourage you to practice writing essays at home. The more you write, the better you will become.

Thank you, everyone, for your participation. See you next time!

Appendix N1: A classroom audio 4 transcribed (CS)

Date: February 01, 2024
Place: Wolaita Sodo University Dawro Tarcha Campus (in the campus)
Class time: Thursday 2:30-4:30 PM
Period duration: 2 hours

Good afternoon, class! Today, we are going to talk about a very important topic in academic writing: essay writing. By the end of this lesson, you will understand the structure of an essay, how to organize your ideas, and some tips for writing clearly and effectively. …

So, the focus today is how to write essays—the different parts of an essay, and how to make your writing better.

…

Let me start by asking: how many of you have written essays in English before? Raise your hands.

(*Wait for a response*)

Great! And how many of you feel confident about writing essays? Mmm, not so many? That's okay—we'll practice together.

Code-switch:

"Itti itti qaalay hintew dexooppe taana oochite."

1: What is an Essay?

Let's begin with the basics: what is an essay? An essay is a piece of writing where you express your ideas about a topic. It has a clear structure, and it's usually formal. For example, you might write an essay to explain your opinion, to argue a point, or to describe something in detail.

Can someone give me an example of a topic you might write an essay about?"

(Wait for a response … e.g., You could write about climate change, your favorite book, or a historical event.)

So, an essay is formal, organized, and focused on one main idea. Ta giyawe geleeddee? Is that clear?

2: Structure of an Essay

Now, let's look at the structure of an essay. An essay has three main parts:

The Introduction, The Body, and The Conclusion.

I'll repeat: introduction, body, and conclusion. Write this down, please.

(*Wait while students take notes.*)

Introduction

The introduction is the first paragraph of your essay. It gives the reader an idea of what your essay is about. It usually has three parts:

- A hook to grab attention,
- Some background information,
- And a thesis statement.

For example, if you're writing about climate change, you could start with:

“Climate change is one of the most urgent problems facing the world today.” That’s your hook. Then, you can explain what climate change is—that’s the background. Finally, your thesis could be: “This essay will discuss the causes and solutions to climate change.”
Can someone tell me, what is a hook? What is its purpose? (*Pause for responses.*)
Great! And what is a thesis statement? Repeat after me: the thesis statement is the main idea of the essay.
Code-switch:
"Introduction paragrafii essayiya nababiiya asa qofa shiishi oyqide essay ay ay huphe qofa oyqeedentto ode. Geleedee?
Next, the **body**. The body is the longest part of the essay. It’s where you explain your main points in detail. Each paragraph in the body should focus on one main idea, and you should support it with examples or evidence.
Example:
If you are writing about climate change, one paragraph could be about the causes, and another paragraph could be about the effects. You need to explain your points clearly and use examples like data, quotes, or personal observations.
Can anyone tell me why examples are important in the body paragraphs? Yes, exactly—they make your argument stronger.
So remember: one idea per paragraph, and always support your ideas with examples.
Code-switch:
Ooshhay de’ii?
Finally, the **conclusion**. This is the last paragraph of your essay. It summarizes your main points and gives a final thought. It’s like saying goodbye to your reader.
Example:
For example: ‘In conclusion, climate change is a serious issue, but by working together, we can find solutions.’ Simple, clear, and powerful.
Let’s review: what are the three parts of an essay? Yes—introduction, body, conclusion.
3: Methods for Essay Writing
Now, let’s talk about how to actually write an essay. I’ll give you three tips:
Plan before you write, Organize your ideas, and Check your grammar and spelling.
Planning:
Before you start writing, think about your topic. Brainstorm ideas and write a quick outline. This will save you time later.
How many of you make outlines before writing? Try it—it’s really helpful.
Organizing Ideas:
When writing, use transition words to connect your ideas. Words like ‘however,’ ‘therefore,’ and ‘for example’ make your essay flow smoothly.
Example:
‘Climate change is a big problem. However, there are solutions.’ See how that connects the ideas?

Checking Grammar and Spelling:
Finally, always check your essay for mistakes. Even small errors can affect your grade.
Now, let's practice. I'll give you a simple essay topic:
'What are the benefits of learning English?'
Write an introduction with a hook, background, and thesis statement. You have 15 minutes. Go ahead
(*Wait and assist as students write.*)
Time's up! Would anyone like to share their introduction? Let's review together.
Today, we learned about essay writing: the structure, how to develop ideas, and some tips for writing better. Remember: practice makes perfect. Try writing one essay this week, and bring it to class for feedback.
Code-switch:
Ooshay de'ooppe oochite. Loyiti lamamadettite.
Thank you, everyone! See you next time!

Appendix O1: Posttest result of sentence writing

SN	ID Number	group	gender	spel	tns	pun	grr	sva	apa	join	log	comp	ordr
1	SSc/R/004/13	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	1	1
2	SSc/R/005/13	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1
3	SSc/R/021/13	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
4	SSc/R/023/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	SSc/R/035/13	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	2
6	SSc/R/042/13	1	1	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	3	2	2
7	SSc/R/050/13	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
8	SSc/R/057/13	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2
9	SSc/R/058/13	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1
10	SSc/R/079/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	SSc/R/093/13	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2
12	SSc/R/108/13	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
13	SSc/R/111/13	1	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2
14	SSc/R/125/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	1	1
15	SSc/R/142/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
16	SSc/R/144/13	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
17	SSc/R/166/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	SSc/R/019/13	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	SSc/R/027/13	2	2	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	4
20	SSc/R/034/13	2	1	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
21	SSc/R/048/13	2	2	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	3
22	SSc/R/054/13	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
23	SSc/R/055/13	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1
24	SSc/R/090/13	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
25	SSc/R/117/13	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1
26	SSc/R/137/13	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
27	SSc/R/138/13	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
28	SSc/R/140/13	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1
29	SSc/R/160/13	2	2	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	3	2
30	SSc/R/161/13	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1
31	SSc/R/168/13	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
32	SSc/R/178/13	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
33	SSc/R/180/13	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	3

Appendix P1: Posttest result of Paragraph writing

SN	ID Number	introduce	divide	coherence	link	conclude	support	evidence	connect	define	goal	cohesive	correct	spell	tense	punctuate
1	SSc/R/004/13	1	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	3	3	2
2	SSc/R/005/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
3	SSc/R/021/13	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	SSc/R/023/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	SSc/R/035/13	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	1	2
6	SSc/R/042/13	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	1	2
7	SSc/R/050/13	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3
8	SSc/R/057/13	1	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2
9	SSc/R/058/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
10	SSc/R/079/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	SSc/R/093/13	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	3	3	2	2
12	SSc/R/108/13	3	3	3	3	4	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2
13	SSc/R/111/13	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2
14	SSc/R/125/13	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
15	SSc/R/142/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
16	SSc/R/144/13	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2
17	SSc/R/166/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	SSc/R/019/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	SSc/R/027/13	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	4	3
20	SSc/R/034/13	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	2
21	SSc/R/048/13	4	3	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	2	4	3	4	4	3
22	SSc/R/054/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
23	SSc/R/055/13	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

24	SSc/R/090/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
25	SSc/R/117/13	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1
26	SSc/R/137/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
27	SSc/R/138/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
28	SSc/R/140/13	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2
29	SSc/R/160/13	3	4	4	4	4	3	2	2	1	1	4	4	4	4	3
30	SSc/R/161/13	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
31	SSc/R/168/13	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	2
32	SSc/R/178/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
33	SSc/R/180/13	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2

Appendix Q1: Posttest result of Essay writing

SN	ID Number	group	gender	introduce	divide	coherence	link	conclude	support	evidence	connect	cite	define	goal	cohesive	correct	spell	tense	punctuate
1	SSc/R/004/13	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
2	SSc/R/005/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	2
3	SSc/R/021/13	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	SSc/R/023/13	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	SSc/R/035/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	1	2
6	SSc/R/042/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	2
7	SSc/R/050/13	1	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3
8	SSc/R/057/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	2
9	SSc/R/058/13	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
10	SSc/R/079/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	SSc/R/093/13	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	2
12	SSc/R/108/13	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	2	2
13	SSc/R/111/13	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
14	SSc/R/125/13	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
15	SSc/R/142/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	SSc/R	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2

6	/144/13																		
17	SSc/R/166/13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	SSc/R/019/13	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	SSc/R/027/13	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	4	3
20	SSc/R/034/13	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
21	SSc/R/048/13	2	2	4	4	3	3	4	3	2	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3
22	SSc/R/054/13	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
23	SSc/R/055/13	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
24	SSc/R/090/13	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
25	SSc/R/117/13	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1
26	SSc/R/137/13	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
27	SSc/R/138/13	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
28	SSc/R/140/13	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2
29	SSc/R/160/13	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	3
30	SSc/R/161/13	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	2
31	SSc/R/168/13	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	2
32	SSc/R/178/13	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
33	SSc/R/180/13	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2

Appendix R1: Independent Samples T-Test for Pretest Performance

a. Group Statistics					
	group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total average performance on pretest	English only	17	12.7647	3.84918	.93356
	code switching	16	12.8750	3.70810	.92702

b. Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Total average performance on pretest	Equal variances assumed	.020	.888	-.084	31	.934	-.11029	1.31718	-2.79670	2.57611
	Equal variances not assumed			-.084	30.980	.934	-.11029	1.31564	-2.79363	2.57305

Appendix S1: Independent Samples T-Test for Language as a feature of writing at sentence level

a. Group Statistics

	group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Language as a feature of writing at sentence level	English only	17	1.7941	.68091	.16515
	code switching	16	1.9062	.88604	.22151

b. Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Language as a feature of writing at sentence level	Equal variances assumed	.462	.502	-.409	31	.685	-.11213	.27408	-.67112	.44686
	Equal variances not assumed			-.406	28.155	.688	-.11213	.27630	-.67796	.45370

Appendix T1: Independent Samples T-Test for Structure as a feature of writing at sentence level

a. Group Statistics

	group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Structure as a feature of writing at sentence level	English only	17	1.7941	.62647	.15194
	code switching	16	1.6406	.81634	.20408

b. Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Structure as a feature of writing at sentence level	Equal variances assumed	.570	.456	.608	31	.548	.15349	.25238	-.36124	.66823
	Equal variances not assumed			.603	28.134	.551	.15349	.25443	-.36758	.67456

Appendix U1: Independent Samples T-Test for Total average performance on sentence writing

a. Group Statistics					
	group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total average performance on sentence writing	English only	17	1.7941	.64272	.15588
	code switching	16	1.8000	.84696	.21174

b. Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Total average performance on sentence writing	Equal variances assumed	.537	.469	-.023	31	.982	-.00588	.26073	-.53764	.52587
	Equal variances not assumed			-.022	27.965	.982	-.00588	.26293	-.54450	.53274

Appendix V1: Independent Samples T-Test for Structure as a feature of writing at paragraph level

a. Group Statistics					
	Group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Structure as a feature of writing at paragraph level	English only	17	1.6118	.72619	.17613
	Code-switching	16	1.6875	.83895	.20974

b. Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Structure as a feature of writing at paragraph level	Equal variances assumed	.001	.974	-.278	31	.783	-.07574	.27265	-.63182	.48035
	Equal variances not assumed			-.277	29.747	.784	-.07574	.27388	-.63527	.48380

Appendix W1: Independent Samples T-Test for Idea Development as a feature of writing at paragraph level

a. Group Statistics

	Group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Idea Development as a feature of writing at paragraph level	English only	17	1.5294	.56592	.13725
	Code-switching	16	1.3333	.42164	.10541

b. Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Idea Development as a feature of writing at paragraph level	Equal variances assumed	3.845	.059	1.123	31	.270	.19608	.17462	-.16005	.55221
	Equal variances not assumed			1.133	29.495	.266	.19608	.17306	-.15761	.54977

Appendix X1: Independent Samples T-Test for Explicitness as a feature of writing at paragraph level

a. Group Statistics					
	Group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Explicitness as a feature of writing at paragraph level	English only	17	1.4314	.54981	.13335
	Code-switching	16	1.2708	.45896	.11474

b. Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Explicitness as a feature of writing at paragraph level	Equal variances assumed	1.063	.311	.907	31	.371	.16054	.17690	-.20026	.52134
	Equal variances not assumed			.913	30.582	.369	.16054	.17592	-.19845	.51953

Appendix Y1: Independent Samples T-Test for Language as a feature of writing at paragraph level

a. Group Statistics

	Group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Language as a feature of writing at paragraph level	English only	17	1.8235	.67757	.16433
	Code-switching	16	1.8906	.95729	.23932

b. Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Language as a feature of writing at paragraph level	Equal variances assumed	2.028	.164	-.234	31	.817	-.06710	.28731	-.65306	.51887
	Equal variances not assumed			-.231	26.878	.819	-.06710	.29031	-.66289	.52870

Appendix Z1: Independent Samples T-Test for Total average performance on paragraph writing

a. Group Statistics

	Group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total average performance on paragraph writing	English only	17	1.6157	.61397	.14891
	Code-switching	16	1.5875	.68301	.17075

b. Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Total average performance on paragraph writing	Equal variances assumed	.000	.994	.125	31	.901	.02819	.22581	-.43236	.48873
	Equal variances not assumed			.124	30.145	.902	.02819	.22656	-.43442	.49079

Appendix A2: Independent Samples T-Test for Structure as a feature of writing at essay level

a. Group Statistics					
	group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Structure as a feature of writing at essay level	English only	17	1.3059	.61285	.14864
	code switching	16	1.5500	.78486	.19621

b. Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Structure as a feature of writing at essay level	Equal variances assumed	1.950	.172	-.999	31	.325	-.24412	.24430	-.74236	.25413
	Equal variances not assumed			-.992	28.390	.330	-.24412	.24616	-.74804	.25980

Appendix B2: Independent Samples T-Test for Idea Development as a feature of writing at essay level

a. Group Statistics

	group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Idea Development as a feature of writing at essay level	English only	17	1.2206	.31724	.07694
	code switching	16	1.1563	.22127	.05532

b. Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Idea Development as a feature of writing at essay level	Equal variances assumed	.232	.634	.672	31	.507	.06434	.09579	-.13103	.25971
	Equal variances not assumed			.679	28.650	.503	.06434	.09476	-.12958	.25825

Appendix C2: Independent Samples T-Test for Explicitness as a feature of writing at essay level

a. Group Statistics					
	group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Explicitness as a feature of writing at essay level	English only	17	1.2549	.41716	.10118
	code switching	16	1.2500	.31032	.07758

b. Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Explicitness as a feature of writing at essay level	Equal variances assumed	.051	.823	.038	31	.970	.00490	.12865	-.25747	.26728
	Equal variances not assumed			.038	29.476	.970	.00490	.12749	-.25567	.26548

Appendix D2: Independent Samples T-Test for Language as a feature of writing at essay level

a. Group Statistics					
	group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Language as a feature of writing at essay level	English only	17	1.7206	.64276	.15589
	code switching	16	1.7969	.88138	.22034

b. Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Language as a feature of writing at essay level	Equal variances assumed	.957	.336	-.285	31	.777	-.07629	.26735	-.62154	.46897
	Equal variances not assumed			-.283	27.350	.780	-.07629	.26991	-.62977	.47720

Appendix E2: Independent Samples T-Test for Total average performance on essay writing

a. Group Statistics

	group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total average performance on essay writing	English only	17	1.3787	.44932	.10898
	code switching	16	1.4570	.54185	.13546

b. Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Total average performance on essay writing	Equal variances assumed	1.894	.179	-.453	31	.653	-.07835	.17285	-.43089	.27418
	Equal variances not assumed			-.451	29.223	.656	-.07835	.17386	-.43381	.27710

Appendix F2: Independent Samples T-Test for Total average performance on POSTTEST

a. Group Statistics

	group of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total average performance on posttest	English only	17	1.5962	.53584	.12996
	code switching	16	1.6148	.67948	.16987

b. Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Total average performance on posttest	Equal variances assumed	.580	.452	-.088	31	.930	-.01868	.21233	-.45173	.41436
	Equal variances not assumed			-.087	28.534	.931	-.01868	.21388	-.45643	.41906

Appendix G2: General Linear Model Output of Paragraph-Level Writing

Table G2.1: Descriptive Statistics by Group

Writing Feature	Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Structure	English only	1.6118	0.72619	17
	Code-switching	1.6875	0.83895	16
Idea Development	English only	1.5294	0.56592	17
	Code-switching	1.3333	0.42164	16
Explicitness	English only	1.4314	0.54981	17
	Code-switching	1.2708	0.45896	16
Language	English only	1.8235	0.67757	17
	Code-switching	1.8906	0.95729	16

Table G2.2: Multivariate Tests – FWPARAGRAPH and FWPARAGRAPH × Group

Multivariate Tests[a]

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
FWPARAGRAPH	Pillai's Trace	.510	10.048[b]	3.000	29.000	.000	.510
	Wilks' Lambda	.490	10.048[b]	3.000	29.000	.000	.510
	Hotelling's Trace	1.039	10.048[b]	3.000	29.000	.000	.510
	Roy's Largest Root	1.039	10.048[b]	3.000	29.000	.000	.510
FWPARAGRAPH * Group	Pillai's Trace	.142	1.599[b]	3.000	29.000	.211	.142
	Wilks' Lambda	.858	1.599[b]	3.000	29.000	.211	.142
	Hotelling's Trace	.165	1.599[b]	3.000	29.000	.211	.142
	Roy's Largest Root	.165	1.599[b]	3.000	29.000	.211	.142

a. Design: Intercept + Group
Within Subjects Design: FWPARAGRAPH

b. Exact statistic

Table G2.3: Mauchly's Test of Sphericity

Mauchly's Test of Sphericity[a]

Measure: MEASURE_1

Within Subjects Effect	Mauchly's W	Approx. Chi-Square	df	Sig.	Epsilon[b]		
					Greenhouse-Geisser	Huynh-Feldt	Lower-bound
FWPARAGRAPH	.228	43.976	5	.000	.579	.630	.333

Tests the null hypothesis that the error covariance matrix of the orthonormalized transformed dependent variables is proportional to an identity matrix.

a. Design: Intercept + Group
Within Subjects Design: FWPARAGRAPH

b. May be used to adjust the degrees of freedom for the averaged tests of significance. Corrected tests are displayed in the Tests of Within-Subjects Effects table.

Table G2.4: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects							
Measure: MEASURE_1							
Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
FWPARAGRAPH	Sphericity Assumed	5.139	3	1.713	19.113	.000	.381
	Greenhouse-Geisser	5.139	1.737	2.958	19.113	.000	.381
	Huynh-Feldt	5.139	1.891	2.718	19.113	.000	.381
	Lower-bound	5.139	1.000	5.139	19.113	.000	.381
FWPARAGRAPH * Group	Sphericity Assumed	.520	3	.173	1.932	.130	.059
	Greenhouse-Geisser	.520	1.737	.299	1.932	.160	.059
	Huynh-Feldt	.520	1.891	.275	1.932	.156	.059
	Lower-bound	.520	1.000	.520	1.932	.174	.059
Error(FWPARAGRAPH)	Sphericity Assumed	8.335	93	.090			
	Greenhouse-Geisser	8.335	53.850	.155			
	Huynh-Feldt	8.335	58.608	.142			
	Lower-bound	8.335	31.000	.269			

Table G2.5: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Measure: MEASURE_1						
Transformed Variable: Average						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	326.020	1	326.020	212.596	.000	.873
Group	.094	1	.094	.061	.806	.002
Error	47.539	31	1.534			

Table G2.6: Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Structure as a feature of writing at paragraph level	Based on Mean	.001	1	31	.974
	Based on Median	.002	1	31	.965
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.002	1	30.996	.965
	Based on trimmed mean	.003	1	31	.959
Idea Development as a feature of writing at paragraph level	Based on Mean	3.845	1	31	.059
	Based on Median	1.963	1	31	.171
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.963	1	29.928	.171
	Based on trimmed mean	3.260	1	31	.081
Explicitness as a feature of writing at paragraph level	Based on Mean	1.063	1	31	.311
	Based on Median	.456	1	31	.505
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.456	1	30.547	.505
	Based on trimmed mean	.698	1	31	.410
Language as a feature of writing at paragraph level	Based on Mean	2.028	1	31	.164
	Based on Median	1.355	1	31	.253
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.355	1	26.800	.255
	Based on trimmed mean	1.819	1	31	.187
Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.					
a. Design: Intercept + Group Within Subjects Design: FWPARAGRAPH					

Appendix H2: General Linear Model Output of Essay-Level Writing

Table H2.1: Descriptive Statistics by Group

Descriptive Statistics				
	group of participants	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Structure as a feature of writing at essay level	English only	1.3059	.61285	17
	code switching	1.5500	.78486	16
	Total	1.4242	.70135	33
Idea Development as a feature of writing at essay level	English only	1.2206	.31724	17
	code switching	1.1563	.22127	16
	Total	1.1894	.27265	33
Explicitness as a feature of writing at essay level	English only	1.2549	.41716	17
	code switching	1.2500	.31032	16
	Total	1.2525	.36353	33
Language as a feature of writing at essay level	English only	1.7206	.64276	17
	code switching	1.7969	.88138	16
	Total	1.7576	.75644	33

Table F2.2: Multivariate Tests – FWPARAGRAPH and FWPARAGRAPH × Group

Multivariate Tests[a]							
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
FWESSAY	Pillai's Trace	.469	8.539[b]	3.000	29.000	.000	.469
	Wilks' Lambda	.531	8.539[b]	3.000	29.000	.000	.469
	Hotelling's Trace	.883	8.539[b]	3.000	29.000	.000	.469
	Roy's Largest Root	.883	8.539[b]	3.000	29.000	.000	.469
FWESSAY * group	Pillai's Trace	.104	1.126[b]	3.000	29.000	.355	.104
	Wilks' Lambda	.896	1.126[b]	3.000	29.000	.355	.104
	Hotelling's Trace	.116	1.126[b]	3.000	29.000	.355	.104
	Roy's Largest Root	.116	1.126[b]	3.000	29.000	.355	.104
a. Design: Intercept + group Within Subjects Design: FWESSAY							
b. Exact statistic							

Table H2.3: Mauchly's Test of Sphericity

Mauchly's Test of Sphericity[a]							
Measure: MEASURE_1							
Within Subjects Effect	Mauchly's W	Approx. Chi-Square	df	Sig.	Epsilon[b]		
					Greenhouse-Geisser	Huynh-Feldt	Lower-bound
FWESSAY	.303	35.463	5	.000	.678	.749	.333
Tests the null hypothesis that the error covariance matrix of the orthonormalized transformed dependent variables is proportional to an identity matrix.							
a. Design: Intercept + group Within Subjects Design: FWESSAY							
b. May be used to adjust the degrees of freedom for the averaged tests of significance. Corrected tests are displayed in the Tests of Within-Subjects Effects table.							

Table H2.4: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects							
Measure: MEASURE_1							
Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
FWESSAY	Sphericity Assumed	6.456	3	2.152	16.577	.000	.348
	Greenhouse-Geisser	6.456	2.033	3.176	16.577	.000	.348
	Huynh-Feldt	6.456	2.247	2.874	16.577	.000	.348
	Lower-bound	6.456	1.000	6.456	16.577	.000	.348
FWESSAY * group	Sphericity Assumed	.443	3	.148	1.139	.338	.035
	Greenhouse-Geisser	.443	2.033	.218	1.139	.327	.035
	Huynh-Feldt	.443	2.247	.197	1.139	.331	.035
	Lower-bound	.443	1.000	.443	1.139	.294	.035
Error(FWESSAY)	Sphericity Assumed	12.073	93	.130			
	Greenhouse-Geisser	12.073	63.012	.192			
	Huynh-Feldt	12.073	69.644	.173			
	Lower-bound	12.073	31.000	.389			

Table H2.5: Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Structure as a feature of writing at essay level	Based on Mean	1.950	1	31	.172
	Based on Median	.958	1	31	.335
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.958	1	30.733	.335
	Based on trimmed mean	2.100	1	31	.157
Idea Development as a feature of writing at essay level	Based on Mean	.232	1	31	.634
	Based on Median	.384	1	31	.540
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.384	1	30.842	.540
	Based on trimmed mean	.300	1	31	.588
Explicitness as a feature of writing at essay level	Based on Mean	.051	1	31	.823
	Based on Median	.002	1	31	.966
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.002	1	22.084	.966
	Based on trimmed mean	.031	1	31	.860
Language as a feature of writing at essay level	Based on Mean	.957	1	31	.336
	Based on Median	.767	1	31	.388
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.767	1	25.149	.389
	Based on trimmed mean	.720	1	31	.403
Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.					
a. Design: Intercept + group Within Subjects Design: FWESSAY					

Table H2.6: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Measure: MEASURE_1						
Transformed Variable: Average						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	261.031	1	261.031	288.868	.000	.903
group	.130	1	.130	.144	.707	.005
Error	28.013	31	.904			

Appendix I2: General Linear Model Output of Comparison across Levels of Writing

Table I2.1: Descriptive Statistics by Group

Descriptive Statistics				
	group of participants	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Total average performance on sentence writing	English only	1.7941	.64272	17
	code switching	1.8000	.84696	16
	Total	1.7970	.73675	33
Total average performance on Paragraph writing	English only	1.6157	.61397	17
	code switching	1.5875	.68301	16
	Total	1.6020	.63825	33
Total average performance on essay writing	English only	1.3787	.44932	17
	code switching	1.4570	.54185	16
	Total	1.4167	.49005	33

Table I2.2: Multivariate Tests – FWPARAGRAPH and FWPARAGRAPH × Group

Multivariate Tests[a]							
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
LEVELSofWriting	Pillai's Trace	.489	14.373[b]	2.000	30.000	.000	.489
	Wilks' Lambda	.511	14.373[b]	2.000	30.000	.000	.489
	Hotelling's Trace	.958	14.373[b]	2.000	30.000	.000	.489
	Roy's Largest Root	.958	14.373[b]	2.000	30.000	.000	.489
LEVELSofWriting * group	Pillai's Trace	.035	.545[b]	2.000	30.000	.585	.035
	Wilks' Lambda	.965	.545[b]	2.000	30.000	.585	.035
	Hotelling's Trace	.036	.545[b]	2.000	30.000	.585	.035
	Roy's Largest Root	.036	.545[b]	2.000	30.000	.585	.035
a. Design: Intercept + group Within Subjects Design: LEVELSofWriting							
b. Exact statistic							

Table I2.3: Mauchly's Test of Sphericity

Mauchly's Test of Sphericity[a]							
Measure: MEASURE_1							
					Epsilon[b]		
Within Subjects Effect	Mauchly's W	Approx. Chi-Square	df	Sig.	Greenhouse-Geisser	Huynh-Feldt	Lower-bound
LEVELSofWriting	.660	12.444	2	.002	.747	.801	.500
Tests the null hypothesis that the error covariance matrix of the orthonormalized transformed dependent variables is proportional to an identity matrix.							
a. Design: Intercept + group Within Subjects Design: LEVELSofWriting							
b. May be used to adjust the degrees of freedom for the averaged tests of significance. Corrected tests are displayed in the Tests of Within-Subjects Effects table.							

Table I2.4: Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects							
Measure: MEASURE_1							
Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
LEVELSofWriting	Sphericity Assumed	2.371	2	1.186	21.154	.000	.406
	Greenhouse-Geisser	2.371	1.493	1.588	21.154	.000	.406
	Huynh-Feldt	2.371	1.602	1.480	21.154	.000	.406
	Lower-bound	2.371	1.000	2.371	21.154	.000	.406
LEVELSofWriting * group	Sphericity Assumed	.049	2	.024	.435	.649	.014
	Greenhouse-Geisser	.049	1.493	.033	.435	.592	.014
	Huynh-Feldt	.049	1.602	.030	.435	.605	.014
	Lower-bound	.049	1.000	.049	.435	.514	.014
Error(LEVELSofWriting)	Sphericity Assumed	3.475	62	.056			
	Greenhouse-Geisser	3.475	46.285	.075			
	Huynh-Feldt	3.475	49.663	.070			
	Lower-bound	3.475	31.000	.112			

Table I2.5: Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Total average performance on sentence writing	Based on Mean	.537	1	31	.469
	Based on Median	.302	1	31	.586
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.302	1	25.732	.587
	Based on trimmed mean	.412	1	31	.526
Total average performance on Paragraph writing	Based on Mean	.000	1	31	.994
	Based on Median	.004	1	31	.949
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.004	1	30.075	.949
	Based on trimmed mean	.000	1	31	.985
Total average performance on essay writing	Based on Mean	1.894	1	31	.179
	Based on Median	1.248	1	31	.273
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.248	1	30.964	.273
	Based on trimmed mean	1.723	1	31	.199
Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.					
a. Design: Intercept + group Within Subjects Design: LEVELSofWriting					

Table I2.6: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Measure: MEASURE_1						
Transformed Variable: Average						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	254.952	1	254.952	228.704	.000	.881
group	.009	1	.009	.008	.930	.000
Error	34.558	31	1.115			

Appendix J2: Interview Transcript 1

Participant: Interviewee 1

Interviewer: Researcher

Date: January 22, 2024

Location: WSUDTC

Time: Afternoon (2:35-2:41 PM)

Introduction

The following transcript is drawn from a semi-structured interview conducted with an English teacher experienced in teaching students majoring in Dawro Doona. The purpose of this interview was to explore the teacher's perceptions and classroom practices related to code-switching (CS) and English-only (EO) instruction.

Interviewer: Thank you for meeting with me today. To begin, could you tell me a little about your experience of teaching English to students majoring in Dawro Doona?

Interviewee 1: Certainly. I've been working with Dawro Doona–speaking students for several years now.

Interviewer: When teaching English to students majoring in Dawro Doona, do you switch between English and their first language? If so, what motivates that decision?

Interviewee 1: Yes, I do switch to Dawro Doona sometimes. I usually do this when students seem confused or when I introduce a difficult concept.

Interviewer: So code-switching functions more as a targeted support strategy than a default method?

Interviewee 1: Yes, exactly. I try to maintain English as the primary medium, but some concepts simply become more accessible when briefly clarified in the students' L1.

Interviewer: From your experience, at which point do students appear more at ease—when you use code-switching or when you adhere strictly to English-only instruction?

Interviewee 1: They are definitely more comfortable when I use code-switching. It reduces their fear of making mistakes and encourages them to participate more actively.

Interviewer: Do you observe noticeable differences in engagement?

Interviewee 1: Yes. When I rely solely on English, certain students become hesitant. Code-switching creates a more welcoming environment where they feel safe to contribute.

Interviewer: In your professional opinion, which instructional approach—CS or EO—tends to lead to better performance or overall achievement?

Interviewee 1: CS helps more, especially at the beginner and intermediate levels. EO might be more useful at advanced stages, but CS is a great scaffold for building understanding.

Interviewer: So you view both approaches as complementary?

Interviewee 1: Exactly. The key is using each method at the appropriate stage of learning.

Interviewer: Focusing specifically on writing skills, at which level—sentence, paragraph, or essay—do students gain the most from code-switching?

Interviewee 1: Students benefit the most at the paragraph level. They often struggle with connecting ideas or organizing their thoughts, and using their L1 as a reference helps them structure paragraphs more clearly.

Interviewer: So L1 support helps them more with coherence and organization rather than grammar?

Interviewee 1: Yes, precisely. Once they understand how ideas link together, their writing becomes much more structured.

Interviewer: Is there anything you would like to add concerning your experience with code-switching or teaching Dawro Doona-speaking students more generally?

Interviewee 1: Only that each class requires adaptation. While code-switching has proven helpful overall, I always adjust based on students' levels and needs.

Interviewer: Thank you very much for your insights and your time.

Appendix K2: Interview Transcript 2

Participant: Interviewee 2

Interviewer: Researcher

Date: January 22, 2024

Location: WSUDTC

Time: Afternoon (3:24-3:28 PM)

Introduction

This transcript reflects a semi-structured interview conducted with Interviewee 2, an English instructor with extensive experience teaching Dawro Doona–speaking students. The conversation explores the teacher's views on code-switching and English-only (EO) instruction.

Interviewer: To get us started, could you share a bit about your background and experience working with Dawro Doona-speaking students?

Interviewee 2: Certainly. I've taught English to students from several linguistic communities, but my most sustained experience has been with Dawro Doona speakers.

Interviewer: When it comes to your day-to-day teaching, how do you handle language choice? Do you move between English and Dawro Doona, or do you try to stick to English only?

Interviewee 2: Yes, I frequently switch between English and Dawro Doona in my classes, especially when introducing new vocabulary, abstract concepts, or complex grammar structures.

Interviewer: So those switches are intentional rather than spontaneous?

Interviewee 2: Exactly. I use them as a strategic tool. Sometimes students need that bridge to fully grasp what's being taught. And beyond clarity, there's also the emotional side of learning. It helps create a supportive environment where they feel secure and ready to learn.

Interviewer: Based on your observations, how do students react when you switch between the two languages? Do they seem more at ease compared to lessons taught in English only?

Interviewee 2: Students are significantly more comfortable when I use code-switching. They tend to respond more actively, ask questions, and participate in discussions when they know they can use their first language when necessary.

Interviewer: That sounds like CS affects not just comprehension but willingness to engage.

Interviewee 2: Absolutely. It lowers anxiety and makes the classroom feel more open. Participation often increases when students feel they can rely on their L1 if they get stuck.

Interviewer: From a performance standpoint, which approach do you feel benefits students more—code-switching or English-only instruction?

Interviewee 2: In my experience, CS contributes significantly to learning outcomes, especially in understanding complex material. "When students can draw on their L1, they are better able to understand the instructions, process the information, and express their ideas."

Interviewer: Do you still find a place for English-only instruction?

Interviewee 2: Definitely, but usually once students reach a higher level. At earlier stages, they need that scaffolding. EO becomes more constructive once their foundation is solid.

Interviewer: Let's focus on writing for a moment. At which level—sentence, paragraph, or essay—do you think code-switching makes the biggest difference?

Interviewee 2: Paragraphs, without question. Students can handle sentence formation, but connecting those sentences is much harder. Organizing a coherent paragraph—linking sentences with logic and flow—is more challenging. When allowed to brainstorm or outline their ideas in Dawro Doona first, they produce better-organized and more meaningful paragraphs.

Interviewer: So their L1 acts almost like a planning tool?

Interviewee 2: Exactly. It helps them clarify their ideas before transferring them into English.

Interviewer: Before we wrap up, is there anything else you'd like to share about your use of code-switching or your experience teaching this student group?

Interviewee 2: Only that flexible language use is key. Overly strict English-only policies can slow students down. Thoughtful code-switching really supports both comprehension and confidence.

Interviewer: Thank you very much for your time and insightful responses.