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Abstract This paper explores the perceptions of Filipino and Indonesian pre-service teachers on code-switching between Cebuano or Bahasa Indonesia, respectively, and English. Attributed to Canagarajah’s Global English, among other theories, this quantitative research described the languages used and the perceptions on code-switching. The study compared the results of the Filipino and Indonesian pre-service teachers' perception on code-switching and identified the preference for language use in both groups. It was found that the respondents are bilingual teachers. Also, both groups agree that teaching in one language only is not beneficial, teaching in both languages is desirable and easier to understand, mixing both languages does not weaken each other, and code-switching assists in higher grades. Almost all respondents prefer the teaching of English through code-switching. Therefore, an empowered use of the local language and an established teaching of a World English variety unique to the Philippines and Indonesia can help pre-service teachers in their future teaching endeavors.
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Introduction

Code-switching is a product of the interlanguage of both a local language and a second language when a second-language speaker attempts to speak with a foreigner or in a formal setting. Horasan (2014) describes it as a natural encounter with mixed languages, often identifiable in learning instances when teachers code-switch to put the message of a subject across. The Philippines, being a product of colonization by the US, accepts English as a second language and has not had any problems with it. The concern, however, is the late adoption of using the local language as an academic medium of instruction through the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) policy for early graders. An ASEAN neighbor of the Philippines, Indonesia, has a different situation. Despite being colonized by the Dutch and Japanese, they were repulsed by using the languages of their colonizers and lobbied for the use of Bahasa Indonesia, their official language, in all aspects, including school. But they also see the necessity of learning a foreign language, specifically the neutral English language, which will help them in global competitiveness, digital technologies, and higher levels of education and life (Isadaud et al., 2022). Pre-service teachers in both countries may have been worried about such instances as to what languages should be used in teaching their learners – the local language, English, or a mixture of both. Additionally, Philippine policymakers discard MTB-MLE (Ugalde, 2022), while Indonesian educationists are changing their elementary curriculum not to include English (Nuraini, 2019). Thus, describing the pre-service teachers’ perceptions of code-switching as a possible strategy for tying the local language and English together might be helpful in uncovering language impact for beginning teachers. Thus, this paper explores the perceptions of pre-service teachers on code-switching between the local language and English and
how such a paradigm is affecting the brand of New Englishes these ASEAN countries are trying to create in themselves.

**Code-Switching in the Philippines**

Multiple studies have been identified on the use of code-switching in English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts such as the Philippines and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts such as Indonesia. Still, there have been no comparative studies between them. In the case of the Philippines, Borlongan (2012) describes how code-switching has recently received attention from scholars, thus the need to consider it in language education policy. Abastillas (2015) clarified that the use of code-switching never relates to language deficiency but instead to competence in both languages (in this case, English and Cebuano), and therefore the not-so-educated can still code-switch in their conversations without regard for correctness but instead on getting the message across. Code-switching and the acceptance of both languages teach children to be socially aware and to adjust to situations despite not being knowledgeable in either language. The point is that code-switching is used in Philippine schools to be communicative. Liwanag and Labor (2016) highlighted that code-switching aids in students’ participation in learning, comprehension in both languages, and incidence of relational work. While code-switching is considered positive, there is still an instance of a negative perception towards code-switching as studied by Pampag and Tejero (2022). While teachers prefer code-switching in the major subject areas, their attitudes towards code-switching differ according to content. In a study by Valerio (2015), while almost all teachers and students agree to code-switching, there is a significant difference in terms of ethnicity, which would mean that these racial groups have a different take on code-switching especially when code-switching with friends, code-switching in English as a good practice, and
combining the local language naturally with English. This concludes that there are still mixed assumptions about code-switching practices in pedagogy in this country. But with MTB-MLE practiced since 2009 in the country, language policies in schools tend to be in question as a focus on the local language must be given much attention. In the case of Bulacan State University, as studied by Cunanan (2013), all stakeholders in the university were concerned about the intellectualization of the local language, as it was not seen as a fit academic language. He adds further that such language policy, whether it be allowing code-switching or refocusing on the local language in academics, is a step towards cultural reconstruction, and therefore universities must be responsive to a new academic language use.

Code-Switching in Indonesia

English in Indonesia, developed as a significant post-colonial language, Indonesians must learn to support development (Isadaud et al., 2022). Sadly, the laws related to language policy in the country do not conform to this aim, as recently they changed their curriculum from the 2006 KTSP, which adopts English as a subject in Elementary to upper secondary, to the 2013 curriculum, which reduces English hours and content to focus on integration of all skills, including language use (Reswari, 2018). Zainil and Arsyad (2021) add to the discussion that a resurgence in teaching Bahasa Indonesia was expected as people were aware of it as a unifying national language. Yet, English became the language that filled the ecological spaces in the country. Therefore, the country has been very accepting of the teaching of local languages while starting to show an interest in learning English with the foreign language as the language of class. As such, code-switching occurs. What is interesting, though, is that Indonesians, particularly young learners and adolescents, find it difficult to practice the target language, and therefore,
code-switching is presumed to be a deficiency (Wijanti, 2014). Yet, Suganda et al. (2018) present data on the code-switching of teachers in EFL classrooms, and they found that using code-switching was natural because it became a tool to show the cultural, social, and communicative aspects of both languages. Similarly, Setiawan (2016) also noticed that English words, phrases, and expressions are inserted in conversations, print and broadcast media, and especially in schools and universities, and such incorporation is seen as an acceptance of the current world language.

Pre-Service Teachers’ Dilemma in Language Use

Mareva et al. (2016) investigated how code-switching relates to emerging varieties of English called New Englishes, as in the case of Zimbabwe in the said research. The study revealed unanimous agreement between code-switching and New Englishes yet ESL and EFL teachers are torn between preferring to teach the local variety of English or standard English. So, if in-service teachers are having difficulty, how much more are pre-service teachers still considering all domains of teaching with language as a minor factor in the process? Tabaku (2014), and Villanueva and Gamiao (2022) discussed the relevance of identifying code-switching as a strategy for pre-service teachers in college. A better understanding of the role of code-switching in schools will make pre-service teachers more aware of this phenomenon. Therefore, they can decide on a variety of activities and techniques with the use of both the local language and English. Also, while Leoanak and Amalo (2018) of Indonesia described the application of code-switching to serve pedagogical aims and, therefore, lead to students’ learning, De Castro et al. (2021) of the Philippines conservatively state that teaching through code-switching has a negative effect on students’ English communicative competence. A lot of questions come to mind when adapting code-switching in
both the Philippines and Indonesia, especially for the pre-service teachers who are preparing themselves for the 21st century. With literature disparities about comparing pre-service teacher training and perceptions on code-switching, especially from these countries, the researcher sought to fill the gap.

Theoretical Framework

This section provides the theoretical underpinnings that led the researcher to investigate the code-switching perceptions of pre-service teachers in Indonesian and Cebuano contexts.

First, Canagarajah’s Global English (2006) and Kachru’s Concentric Circles (1985) discuss the spread of English in terms of the three concentric circles: the inner circle, the outer circle, and the expanding circle. This dynamic model suggests that while World Englishes can be classified as such based on historical and cultural aspects, the suggestion is not to define boundaries as languages might still develop on a larger scale. For now, Philippine English belongs to the outer circle as the country has been colonized by the US, from which it has learned the use of standard English. As such, the language permeated the country as a second language, as identified in schools and the constitution. Indonesia, a country not colonized by any English-speaking nation, uses English as a Foreign language and even dubbed it their first foreign language as it is seen as neutral. Also, the functions of English in the country are limited to foreign language instruction, media and entertainment, and regional and worldwide cooperation and collaboration. This study focuses on New Englishes as described in pre-service teachers’ teaching and language use in the Philippines and Indonesia. Recognizing how the respondents use English as a second or other language makes up for the relevance of the issue on a global scale.
Second, Blom and Gumperz (1972, 2020) coined “Metaphorical Code-switching,” suggesting that multilingual communities switch codes depending on social factors in the communication process. Looking at the macro and micro perspectives of language use in social contexts, the theorists assert that a speaker permits the alternation of two codes at grammatical levels based on a conscious effort. Hence, the current study believes that the use of the local language and English in the classroom is patterned by the pre-service teachers’ social conditions and perceptions of appropriateness and benefits, allowing them to decide which language variety is more useful in pedagogy. All these major code-switching concepts stem from Fishman’s Domain Specificity Theory (1970), which explains how language choice and sociolinguistics interweave, specifically interaction, language attitudes, behavior, and norms.

Additionally, Gumperz (1982), in his discourse strategies, mentioned that code-switching is a juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of utterances belonging to two different grammatical systems. The alternation that can happen in sentences, tags, or in-betweens becomes a natural process of the conversation because of the situation or context the speaker and listener are in. World Englishes are related to code-switching as discussed by Bullock, Hinrichs, and Toribio (2014), in that code-switching (could also be referred to as structural borrowing, transfer, interference, and imposition) mirrors the diverse structural patterns that are encountered in bilingual speech. The natural mixing arises as a response to the embedding of World Englishes varieties at the community, individual, and interactional levels. With code-switching described as a discourse strategy, the pre-service teachers are asked how they perceive using it in their teaching practice. Their responses inform us about code-switching applied to pre-service teacher training and policy drafting on local language use and code-switching.
Third, code-switching is a product not just of natural conversation in sociolinguistics but also of the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) of Rivers (Gumperz, 1983). According to this traditional method in English language teaching, its major principle is translation from and into the target language, which is code-switching. Pre-service teachers can identify that GTM supports the presence of other language teaching methods, such as code-switching and direct methods. Several questions are provided about how the respondents perceive the teaching of one or multiple languages and which language to use as teachers.

**Purposes of the Research**

This paper explores the perceptions of pre-service teachers about code-switching between the local language (Cebuano or Bahasa Indonesia) and English and how such insights and comparisons affect the brand of New Englishes these ASEAN countries (The Philippines and Indonesia) are employing.

Specifically, the research addresses the following aims:

1. Describe the languages used and perceptions of pre-service teachers on code-switching;
2. Compare the code-switching perceptions of pre-service teachers from Indonesia teaching in Bahasa Indonesia and from the Philippines teaching in Cebuano; and
3. Identify the preference for language use in both groups and explain the reason for the language choice.
Research Design and Methods

This research employed a quantitative design with a descriptive survey method that describes the perceptions of the pre-service teachers about code-switching from Bahasa Indonesia to English or Cebuano to English. Percentages and weighted means were computed, which served as the quantifiable data of the study. Students’ responses to open-ended questions were identified and treated as well, which could add depth to the results and implications.

Participants

In the Philippines, as represented by a teacher-education institution (TEI), which is a Center of Excellence in Teacher Education, the respondents were 65 pre-service teachers. They are individuals ranging in age from 18-25 years old who are enrolled in Education degrees. They have English as a primary subject from elementary to college, yet their first language is mostly Cebuano. For Indonesia, 16 pre-service teachers from the university who had contact with the Philippine TEI became the respondents. Both universities are participants in the SEAMEO SEA-Teacher Student Teacher Exchange Program in Southeast Asia, whose aim is to improve the English fluency skills of the pre-service teachers in teaching their content area or specialization in another host country. Their pre-service teachers are individuals ranging from 20-25 years old who can speak fluent English, Bahasa Indonesia, and the local language of the province where they currently live. The research invited respondents within a week-long time frame to answer the online poll prepared by the researcher. More than 75% of the total respondents in each group are female, with 52 females against 13 males from the Philippines and 14 females against two males from Indonesia. This data matches current statistics in the Philippines that show more women are enrolled than men (55.6% female
The enrollees as of AY 2017-2018 (San Buenaventura, 2019). In Indonesia, according to OECD 2016 report, more women are enrolled than men in health and welfare, where education is included.

**Instruments**

The online poll questionnaire through Google Forms is composed of three parts. The first part is the biographical entry part, which asks the respondents’ gender and the language/s they speak, were taught, and are used. The second part is a set of questions on the respondents’ perceptions of code-switching. They are asked to answer what level of agreement they have with the statement, whether they Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), or Strongly Agree (4). These questions are taken from Alenezi’s (2016) study about students’ language attitudes toward code-switching in college. The last part of the questionnaire asks them what language/s they prefer to teach. They are also asked an open-ended question to explain why they answered with such language/s. A pre-service teacher educator from the Philippines and Indonesia served as the content validator of the research instrument. The Cronbach’s Alpha reliability index of the tool was .74, suggesting higher internal consistency.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

The collection of data was done online through the snowball sampling method, recruiting pre-service teachers from both universities to respond to the survey questionnaire. Ethical considerations include voluntary participation, not asking for respondents’ names and other identifiers to maintain anonymity, and limiting access to the results only to the researcher for confidentiality.

After collating all the results of the questionnaire, the weighted means and percentages for each statement and question were computed and presented in tabular form. The
results of the open-ended question were organized into themes for easier reference. The researcher discussed and analyzed all these results to describe the code-switching perceptions of pre-service teachers from the Philippines and Indonesia.

**Results and Discussion**

This section discusses the results obtained from the research conducted through online survey questionnaires.

**Languages by Pre-service Teachers**

**Table 1**

*Languages by Pre-service Teachers (Philippines)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>PSTs’ Language/s Spoken Proficiently (%)</th>
<th>PSTs’ Language/s Been Taught With (%)</th>
<th>PSTs’ Language/s Used with Classmates (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cebuano</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino (Tagalog)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebuano and English</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebuano and Filipino</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Filipino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebuano, English, Filipino</td>
<td>64.06</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebuano, English, other languages</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceb, Eng, Fil, other languages</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 presents the languages spoken proficiently by the pre-service teachers. More than 60% say that they are proficient in three languages: Cebuano, English, and Tagalog, which would consider them multilingual. Nearly 50% declare
that the language of instruction used to them in teaching is English. Using Cebuano, English, and Filipino is only second with 20%. The last column shows that 45% of the respondents say they use Cebuano and English together to communicate with classmates on academic matters. All these results mean that pre-service teachers are multilingual, influenced by the languages they proficiently speak, the classroom language used, and the languages they use to communicate socially. Since the pre-service teachers in Cebu have significant experience using the local language, English, and Filipino, over the years through school, media, and other sources, it has become common for them to use and blend these languages. The coexistence of all other languages in the survey, such as Spanish, Boholano, and Porohanon, also signifies the respondents' recognition of their own languages as additional factors to their linguistic aspects. At the same time, these results affirm Cunanan’s (2013) claim that multilingualism is the condition of Philippine schools and universities, which is why a language policy must be in place to clarify such a stance. It is also noticeable that the respondents were primarily taught in English, as this is the product of the bilingual education policy in the country, in which English is the primary medium of instruction in schools. It is only recently that MTB-MLE has been applied, and the respondents have not experienced using the local language when they were students. Still, some respondents have confessed that their teachers taught them in the local language as the teachers are concerned with understanding. Pre-service teachers in Cebu have gained substantial experience in using the local language, English, and Filipino over the years, primarily through school, media, and other sources. Consequently, it has become a common practice for them to use and intermingle these languages. Besa (2013) reiterates in her study that there has been no objection to the use of English as a prescribed language while considering students’ local languages, which can be finalized into a language policy all schools can adopt.
### Table 2

**Languages by Pre-service Teachers (Indonesia)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>PSTs’ Language/s Spoken Proficiently (%)</th>
<th>PSTs’ Language/s Been Taught With (%)</th>
<th>PSTs’ Language/s Used with Classmates (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Indonesia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahasa Indonesia and English</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Indo, Eng, other languages</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and other languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows languages of the Indonesian pre-service teacher respondents. More than 60% of the pre-service teachers are equally proficient in Bahasa Indonesia and English. This could prove how Indonesia has successfully promoted Bahasa as the national language of unity in the country, while English is the ‘first’ foreign language to be considered for international cooperation. Regarding school language experience, 60% of the respondents had been taught in Bahasa Indonesia and had used it when conversing with classmates or peers. Second in both items, with about 20%, is using both Bahasa Indonesia and English. A few participants have been taught and are using other languages besides Bahasa Indonesia and English. In Indonesia, the medium of instruction is Bahasa Indonesia, and even the teaching of English is in the local language. That is why Bahasa Indonesia topped in languages being taught. In the country, teaching English is mandatory, but the teachers, who are not native English speakers, have depended on the knowledge and skills of their teaching staff to help students grasp the designated international language in the curriculum. As such,
the natural tendency is to teach through code-switching the two languages – English and Bahasa Indonesia (Zainil & Arsyad, 2021).

**Perceptions on Code-switching**

**Table 3**

*Perceptions on Code-switching by Pre-service Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teaching in only one language is beneficial</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teaching in English and L1 is desirable</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teaching in English and L1 makes easy to understand</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Confusing when taught in English and L1 in same period</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mixing English and L1 weakens one’s local language</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mixing English and L1 weakens one’s English</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mixing English and L1 strengthens one’s English</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respect to instructor when teaching in English</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Respect to instructor when teaching in L1</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Respect to instructor when teaching in English/L1</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teaching in English increases good grades</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teaching in L1 increases good grades</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Teaching in Eng and L1 increases good grades</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation:
1.00-1.80 (Strongly Disagree), 1.81-2.60 (Disagree), 2.61-3.20 (Agree), 3.21-4.00 (Strongly Agree)
Table 3 presents the perceptions of the pre-service teachers on code-switching in the Philippines and Indonesia, respectively. In the first statement on having one language as beneficial, both groups disagree. This means that the pre-service teachers already have the notion that teaching in one language is not the norm and that the use of multiple languages can bring more benefits. Philippines as part of Kachru’s outer circle and Indonesia belonging to the expanding circle, have benefited not from the use of only one language but from the mixing of languages, in which multilingualism is highly evident in these countries. Similarly, English is not even seen as a foreign language in these countries but rather as a basic skill in the global world. Therefore, a multilingual approach to pedagogy is beneficial. Introducing code-switching in college (i.e., pre-service teacher training) facilitates multilingual learning (Villanueva & Gamiao, 2022).

Items 2-4 refer to which form of language is desirable and easy to understand, so hoping it will not be confusing to students. Both groups agree that teaching English and L1 together, through code-switching, is desirable and easy to understand, with the Philippines having a higher ‘strongly agree’ stance on using both languages to make the lesson easier to understand. When it comes to whether using both languages together may cause confusion, both groups say ‘disagree’. Wijaya (2021) pointed out that the main reasons teachers code-switch are to repeat some vague materials and concepts, lead learners to obtain new words and information, translate unfamiliar concepts, elucidate prior learning misconceptions, and ultimately avoid miscommunication. Borlongan (2012) also defined the need in multilingual educational communities as a practical approach to facilitate student learning, and this is through the negotiation of two languages towards understanding. In Indonesia as presented in Suganda et al.'s (2018) research, the function of using both languages through code-switching in classrooms builds
on previous knowledge and uses the local language as an
intermediator to clarify understanding, reduce confusion, and
facilitate learning.

Mixing English and L1 and whether it strengthens or
weakens the English and L1 competence of the learner are
asked in items 5-7. Both groups disagree that mixing
English and L1 weakens the local language. Valerio’s (2015)
results signify that the use of code-switching or mixing both
languages is not a weakness, as the respondents replied. But
rather, it makes learners more patriotic and nationalistic if
they can use their L1. As such, there has been no issue
with local languages being disregarded. Rather, this is an
opportunity for the local language, in this case, Cebuano and
Bahasa Indonesia, to be made academic or formalized. Both
groups also disagree that mixing the two languages weakens
one’s English and that mixing both languages strengthens it.
Conclusions to Setiawan’s (2016) research indicate that
code-switching or mixing the two languages enriches the
language repertoire of the learner and thus strengthens
English, especially, in sociolinguistic and strategic aspects.

Items 8-10 asked respondents whether their or their
teachers’ use of code-switching had affected their respect for
the instructor. Both groups nearly got the same results in that
they agreed that they become more respectful to their teacher
teaching in both English and the local language. But unlike
the Philippines, Indonesia got a remarkably high percentage
of agreement on the statement that they respect their teachers
more when using the local language. This would mean
that Indonesians have really seen their language, Bahasa
Indonesia, as a symbol of unity and patriotism, and therefore
they respect the teacher when using the local language. It is
not fair to say that the Philippines does not respect the teachers
when using L1 just because Indonesia cares so much about
their L1-speaking teachers; it is just that the respondents have
not had much experience with teachers speaking in the local
language. Still, they agree that teachers are respectable no matter what. Wijaya (2021) points out that teachers are well respected in Indonesia, not just because of their language use but also because of their expectation to have a great rapport with their students and the community. Through teachers, English contributes to national development while maintaining an equal stance with local culture and language. Similar Philippine studies (Alenezi, 2016; Cunanan, 2013; Valerio, 2015) have shown that students show positive attitudes toward code-switching teachers and see them as a valuable resource for learning.

The last three statements (Items 11-13) all relate to code-switching in both languages as a factor in the high grades of learners. Kuzyk et al. (2020) conducted a longitudinal research on code-switching to predict executive cognitive function performance in code-switching behaviors. Those children who mixed or switched between codes performed better in filling lexical gaps and socializing with peers (Kuzyk et al., 2020). Both pre-service teacher groups then agreed that English and L1 would lead them to good grades. The Indonesian group has shown quite a larger percentage of ‘strongly agree’ on the statement ‘teaching in English increases good grades.’ This could have been due to the idea that because English is a compulsory subject to them when the teacher teaches in the target language, they can better achieve the outcomes of the course. Sadly, English classes in Indonesia are taught in the local language, so there are no models recognizable for such issues. The Indonesian English teachers, according to Leoanak and Amalo (2018), even strongly agree that if they use English in their classes, the better the students’ assessment results.
Preference in Language when Teaching

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Preferences</th>
<th>Preference in Language when Teaching (Philippines) (%)</th>
<th>Preference in Language when Teaching (Indonesia) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local language only</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English and local language</td>
<td>95.38</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With more than 80% in both groups of pre-service teachers prefer teaching in both English and the local language. The pre-service teachers, thinking mostly about what could assist them when they deliver the expected content, outcomes, and instruction in their respective schools, would choose the option that would lead them toward such success. And having the benefits of both languages can give them the best of both worlds. Chughtai et al. (2016) assert that most teachers and students code-switch for numerous classroom reasons, such as doing classroom activities smoothly, conversing with friends, dealing with transactions in the canteen and library, consultation with teachers, and other relevant day-to-day tasks. Cunanan (2013) has also listed reasons why faculty members would prefer code-switching or mixing of both codes: lessen the anxiety of learners, refocus on understanding and empathy, and make the teaching-learning process faster and more time-efficient. But Cunanan asserts further that a language policy must be set to consider all things while not putting down the current laws and regulations intended for the local language.
Preference in Languages and Code-switching Ideas

As we look at the respondents’ explanations, almost all are positive reasons towards using two or more languages and code-switching in classes. Some answers relate to the conclusions of the study by Hait (2014), which state that exposure to English for long periods will assist learners with forming correct morphosyntactic rules even with the use of code-switching, as it will lessen anxiety. Some responses from the Philippine pre-service teachers on the positive use of code-switching, especially on functions of CS, are:

*Speaking both English and the local language is best for us to understand well and also to explain ourselves properly.* (F7)

*Some terms are better understood when elaborated on and further explained by instructors in English and the local language.* (F8)

*It is easy for the student to understand if the topic’s examples are presented in the local language. I think it’s time to strengthen the local language to compete with English.* (F12)

*We must learn to adapt and accept diversity for us to learn more.* (F25)

*So that I can understand properly because there are some instructions in English that is hard to understand.* (F28)

*For the curriculum to be most effective, especially for disadvantaged and marginalized students, it should be in their language, be culturally sensitive, and incorporate indigenous culture and traditions.* (F38)
In such responses, the pre-service teachers think that code-switching is relevant because it is for (1) easier understanding and explanation, (2) vocabulary building, (3) giving of examples and contextualization, (4) adapting to diversity, (5) instructions and regulating students, and (6) inclusion, especially of the marginalized.

Also, most respondents have equal regard for English and the local language. They also agree that both must be taught to students. Some responses related to this agreement are:

Native language instruction also benefits a student’s overall well-being. Students who enjoy school are happier and more successful when taught in their own language. (F38)

As a learner, there are times when English becomes too difficult that there’s a need to switch on the native language to learn meaningfully. (F52)

Using both English and the local language optimizes learning... group discussions and sharing, for example, are well managed using local language. (F56)

If the course is taught both in English and local language this will create balance and make the students flexible when it comes to their learnings. By that, wherever country or places they may go they can easily blend, especially since English is considered as the universal language. (F58)

These responses affirm Leimgruber’s (2013) statement, in which he said that pure monolingualism is non-existent, especially when considering specific social meanings, token knowledge of non-English words, and
differences across speakers. Also, respondents affirm that code-switching is beneficial to learning.

On the other hand, the Indonesian pre-service teacher respondents also agree with code-switching in Bahasa Indonesia and English. Their responses show reasons to the learning of both languages:

*It makes me feel comfortable and helps me understand the lesson well.* (I2)

*First, we know in Indonesia not over all student can speak English. But when we try to teach English step by step, it will help students understand to speak English. So the solution is teach with mix language.* (I1)

*English: international language, we will need it in real life. But I kind of disagree, learning in English/Bahasa or mixed language not very influential in determining one’s intelligence level.* (I11)

*Karena agar lebih mengasah kemampuan Bahasa Inggris dan lebih mudah dimengerti (Because in order to better hone English skills and more understood).* (I7)

These responses relate to Setiawan (2016), who said that Indonesians code-switch as a steppingstone to a more comprehensive use of the English language. Such utterance is not seen as inferior but as a status symbol in their society. But what makes the pre-service teachers unique in Indonesia is their high reverence for their local language. This is seen in some responses, such as:

*English as International language, it means that I have bekal (provision) for my future, as Indonesian, I wouldn’t let it disappear.* We
I need to increase my English or improve my English, but I need to appreciate local language, because we know local language first and then English, so it’s okay for me to use local mix with English. (I16)

Results in the research of Leoanak and Amalo (2018) show that they disagree with the strict separation of Bahasa Indonesia and English as they are part of the sociolinguistic arrangement of Indonesian society. At the same time, Indonesians put high regard to these languages. This finding is related to the responses above in that high respect for the local language would benefit its intellectualization when being switched to English in classroom interaction.

Pre-Service Teachers’ Say on Language Choice

With changes in language policy and language curriculum, pre-service teachers in the Philippines and Indonesia need help preparing and selecting pedagogical approaches. While both countries are willing to explore New Englishes, pre-service teachers’ question revolve around the disparity between what languages they know and grew up with and what they should apply in their teaching practice. The swinging from one language to another turned out to be code-switching, a concerning language variety that might be acceptable. They might have to find a way to go as policies are in place. Still, the study highlighted how their perceptions of code-switching brought about their conscious decision to use the local language and/or English appropriately, demand respect, show appreciation for language use, and gain learning outcomes. Owing to Blom and Gumperz (1972), code-switching is perceived by pre-service teachers as a viable discourse strategy. It is facilitative towards Rivers’s (1983) Grammar-Translation Method in primary education language
classrooms. Soon, the ASEAN pre-service teachers will see a research-based use of a common language, New English, and a code-switching variety of languages to teach the subjects and improve the quality of basic education through a mindful choice of medium of instruction.

Conclusion and Recommendations

As code-switching is taking place in the pedagogical tenets in the classroom, especially in language concerns, pre-service teachers are in a quandary as they are still preparing both their personal and professional selves. Having a more informed choice in language use while teaching will help them be better prepared more for their teacher roles. As such, this study aimed to identify the perceptions of pre-service teachers. At the same time, this research tried to present and compare results in the Philippines using Cebuano and Indonesia using Bahasa Indonesia, being code-switched with English.

As to languages spoken, both groups are bilingual, with more than 60% of the respondents using Cebuano, English, and other languages (for the Philippines), Bahasa Indonesia, and English (for Indonesia). As to languages taught, the Philippines got a high percentage with English as the medium of instruction, which puts us in the position of using English as a second language, while in Indonesia, a good number are taught in Bahasa Indonesia. Therefore, English is a foreign language for them. Regarding the languages used with classmates, both groups had their local languages in common. As to perceptions, both groups have the same ideas on code-switching: teaching in one language only is not beneficial, teaching in both local language and English is desirable and easier to understand, mixing local language and English does not weaken each of the languages, and code-switching in both languages
assists in higher grades. More than 85% of each group prefer teaching in both languages through code-switching because it is more understandable and assists in vocabulary building, among other reasons. Therefore, an empowered use of the local languages and established teaching of English using the World English variety unique to the Philippines and Indonesia can help pre-service teachers in their future teaching endeavors.

The study is limited to pre-service teachers’ perceptions at one representative university per country. Further studies may widen the population of pre-service teacher participants from several types of teacher education institutions, as this might give further analysis of the pre-service teacher preparation towards teaching the local language and New Englishes. Studies beyond perceptions, such as the effectiveness of code-switching or a qualitative inquiry into language teaching, may clarify the stance on the effectiveness of code-switching in the two countries. Tapping institutions from other outer circles and expanding circle countries may also illuminate other perceptions or issues regarding code-switching.

Looking forward, the researcher hopes that the study can inform decisions on pre-service teacher training on MTB-MLE, code-switching as a scaffolding strategy, translanguaging as a pedagogical approach, policies on language use by teachers and students, and the reach of the implications of New English varieties before, during, and after language teaching training. Comparative studies of language education systems will also uplift cooperation and sharing of best practices to further the cause of quality and inclusive basic education regardless of one’s first language and English language usage.
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