

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJL2C_118088
Title of the Manuscript:	CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS USING CODE-SWITCHING AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION: COMPREHENSION SKILLS IN FOCUS
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript addresses the practical challenges encountered by college students when code-switching is used as a medium of instruction to improve comprehension skills. This topic is significant for the scientific community as it contributes to the understanding of language proficiency and educational strategies in multilingual societies. The study's focus on the real-world implications of code-switching in classroom settings provides valuable insights that can inform educational policies and teaching methods. Yes. There were quite a few important aspects missing in the abstract: The claim about limited research on this topic seems to be at odds with the existing literature, and it would be beneficial to provide a more nuanced argument or specify an aspect that has not been extensively covered. The methodology could be more detailed, including the level and field of study of the learners, the languages they speak, and the location of the study (Are the participants undergraduate students or research scholars? Are they engineering students or English students? Did the study take place in the Philippines or somewhere else? What are their first and second language) as these factors can significantly affect the outcomes. The keywords could be improved by including terms not present in the title to increase the visibility of your paper. With these improvements, the abstract could provide a more accurate and compelling snapshot of your research. The structure of the manuscript is sound; however, the subheadings are not clearly marked/numbered/highlighted. In the result and discussion section, subheadings like Excessive use of highfalutin words, Poor Pronunciation, etc, are not marked properly, which leads to confusion as to whether it's a subheading or a statement. The author should consider using appropriate bullet points for the same. The manuscript seems to adhere to scientific standards. It employs a purposive sampling method, follows a structured data analysis process, and observes ethical standards. The study's findings are discussed in the context of existing literature, and the implications are grounded in the observed data. Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. However, the author should follow proper APA format(if prescribed by the journal) and should italicise the journal names. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality of the article is appropriate for scholarly communications, provided that it maintains clarity and accessibility alongside its academic rigor. The author should revise two paragraphs as I found language errors in those two. First is the paragraph just before the research questions. For example, in the line, <i>'By addressing this critical issue, the research aims to enhance our understanding of effective language instruction strategies and support the overarching goal of improving educational outcomes in the Philippines (Aguilar, 2021).'</i> I don't understand why the researcher has given a reference at the end of this line? This was supposed to be one of the objectives of the researcher. The point being, the author should give a check to the use of references, especially in this paragraph.</p> <p>Apart from this I find the implications of this study to be somewhat clear, but they could be made more explicit and detailed. Here are my comments:</p> <p>Code-switching and pronunciation: The study rightly identifies the benefits of code-switching for students' comprehension and the potential issues with instructors' pronunciation. However, it could provide more concrete examples or data to support these claims. The suggestion for teacher training and student activities is a good one, but the study could go further in outlining what these might look like in practice.</p> <p>Use of highfalutin words: The study identifies an important issue with the use of complex</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>vocabulary. However, it could provide clearer guidelines on what constitutes “excessive” use and how teachers can strike the right balance. The claim that highfalutin words can motivate learners is interesting, but needs more supporting evidence.</p> <p>Limiting code-switching to certain functions: The study suggests limiting code-switching to referential, poetic, and phatic functions, but it doesn’t fully explain why these functions were chosen or how this limitation would be implemented in the classroom. More explanation and justification would be helpful here.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Talking about research question 3: What are the different functions of code-switching? It must be talked about at least briefly in the introduction. These are nowhere mentioned. 2. In the “Method- Design and Procedure” section, the author wrote ‘<i>Data were collected through semi-structured interviews conducted via face-to-face or virtual meetings.</i>’ The author should not be confused and clearly state face-to-face and virtual meetings or either one of them. 3. In the “Method- Data Analysis” section, the author wrote, ‘<i>The analysis followed the seven phases of data analysis as described by Marshall and Rossman (2014).</i>’ However, the author mentioned only six phases. 4. The figure 1 is suggesting that Excessive use of highfalutin words leads to the poor pronunciation, and poor pronunciation leads to a sudden switch of languages. However, these are not the researcher’s actual findings. The figure is just conveying misinformation. They should thus should consider changing it, making it a flowchart instead. <p>These are some minor, simple, yet effective suggestions the researcher may undertake.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Shadab Khan</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Hyderabad, India</p>