


Fall 12-16-2016

Code Switching in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

George H. Keller
georgehkeller@comcast.net

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.usfca.edu/capstone>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Keller, George H., "Code Switching in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages" (2016). *Master's Projects and Capstones*. 480.
<https://repository.usfca.edu/capstone/480>

This Project/Capstone is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects at USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Projects and Capstones by an authorized administrator of USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. For more information, please contact repository@usfca.edu.

University of San Francisco

**Code Switching
In Teaching English
To Speakers Of Other Languages**

A Field Project Presented to
The Faculty of the School of Education
International and Multicultural Education Department

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

by
George Keller
December 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgement.....	iii
Abstract.....	1
Chapter I – Introduction.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Project.....	5
Theoretical Framework.....	6
Significance of the Project.....	7
Chapter II – Review of the Literature.....	10
Introduction.....	10
The Development of ELT Pedagogy.....	10
“English Only”.....	11
Code switching.....	14
Limitations.....	16
Benefits.....	17
The L2 Classroom: Teacher and Student.....	25
Teacher code switching.....	28
Student code switching.....	31
Handling obstacles to L2 use.....	33
The Advanced L2 Student in A Multilingual World.....	35
Summary.....	40
Chapter III – The Project and Its Development.....	42
Description of the Project.....	42
Development of the Project.....	43
The Project “Code Switching: A Guidebook”.....	45
Chapter IV – Conclusions and Recommendations.....	90
Conclusions.....	90
Recommendations.....	92
References.....	94

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I express deep gratitude to my husband, Rogelio Perales Ortega, for providing me with continuous encouragement and the ability to maintain perspective throughout the process of researching and writing this field project. You are always there for me. Thank you, Snooty.

And I express a special thanks to my mother, Bernice Fox Keller, for always providing me with love and appreciation for the value of education. Thank you, Mom.

ABSTRACT

One of the most controversial issues in foreign language teaching and learning over many years has been the role of the students' L1 in L2 target language education. While a monolingual approach prohibited the use of the target language in L2 classroom, researchers have reexamined the issues related to the use of students' L1 through code switching in the L2 classroom since the 1990s. The results of these studies have shown that the L1, if used properly and judiciously, may serve important functions for the learning process and social environment of the classroom. The purpose of this study was a systematic literature review of this research for the preparation of a guidebook as to the functions, manner, reasons, and contributions of code switching as a part of 2L English language teaching.

Key Words: code switching, English as a Foreign Language (EFL), first language (1L), language teaching, language learning, classroom interaction

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In multilingual countries, many languages are facts of life; any restriction in the choice of language is a nuisance; and one language is not only uneconomic, it is absurd. (Pattanayak, 1984)

Communicative competence has been defined and discussed in many different ways by language scholars as a major departure from earlier pedagogical approaches, particularly the use of the grammar translation method. As the field of sociolinguistics, specifically language acquisition, has shifted focus from grammar to communication, second language (L2) teachers and researchers have attempted to also shift their teaching methodologies and linguistic analyses. With the continued expansion of English use as a foreign or second language, code switching has become an ever-increasing norm within English language societies and throughout the increasingly globalized world of speakers using English as part of a multiple language repertoire (Greggio & Gil, 2007).

However, many instructors of English as a foreign (EFL) and English second language (ESL) have relied on the principle of English Only in the classroom setting, vehemently denying and disallowing the use of the English learner's first language (L1) for any purposes. Yet code switching is a normal practice among bilingual and multilingual speakers in relation to situational factors, such as setting and social relations, as well as speaker motivations (Wolfram & Schilling, 2015). Code switching has thus become an ever-increasing reality within English language societies, throughout the world, and thus inside the classroom as well.

Research indicates that benefits attributable to proper employment of L1 code switching with EFL learners include a head start of successful learning achievement so as

to encourage the gradual yet continuous increase in English proficiency, strategy development with the student in order to make difficult learning tasks more practicably manageable, and thus attainment and maintenance of student interest in further language learning tasks (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Anton & DiCamilla, 1998). L1 code switching allows learners to retain focus on the broader goals of a learning task while concomitantly working out ways to address a specific learning issue. In a relaxed, yet fully focused manner, learners may more readily participate in classroom practice and activities with greater resultant advancement in learning the English language (Modupeola, 2013).

This is especially germane to the foundational level under a classroom structure. In order to communicate effectively, learners require the ability to draw from a *range* of relevant languages, including but not limited to English, as support for the learner's communicative purposes. And where pupils already are accustomed to code switching outside the classroom in multilingual speaking environments, there are platforms already in place which may be drawn upon and further expanded. Furthermore, in a wider political and policy context, multiculturalism represented by the L1 rather than English Only can validate the students' own cultures and languages.

Code switching may be seen as a usable tool in order to assist the English language teaching and learning process at the foundation level, especially where it is a skill being introduced to the pupils living in multilingual speaking environments. At a functional level, studies have demonstrated that the L1 can serve a number of goals for learners of English as a second or foreign language, including developing strategies and approaches to make a difficult task more manageable, a head start in achieving effective

and successful learning so as to gradually become proficient English language speakers, and thus enlisting and maintaining interest in the task.) Research has also identified that L1 code switching allows learners to focus on the goals of the task and work out ways to address specific problems. Thus, from a broader scope to a narrower one, code switching can assist English language learners in *inter alia* (1) task management through L1 discussion about how the task should be completed; (2) task clarification through L1 discussion about the meaning of the task prompt and instructions; (3) vocabulary and meaning through discussion about lexical choice and definitions of words; and (4) grammar through deliberation about grammatical points. (See, e.g., Anton & DiCamilla, 1998; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Swain & Lapkin, 2000; Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976)

L1 use as a part of teaching English as a second or foreign language not only assists learners in the process and completion of the task but also creates a space for learners to provide each other and themselves with support and help through to completion of the task. From this social and emotional viewpoint, learners' exposure to code switching at the early stages of learning English as a second or foreign language assists in creating an enjoyable environment due to the ability to adequately comprehend the teacher's instructional input with a modicum of comfort. And once they are comfortable with the environment, without any unnecessary anxiety due to initial emotional support, learners will be able to more readily and fully focus and participate in classroom practice and activities with greater success in a more relaxed and comfortable manner learning the English language (Modupeola, 2013).

Code switching presents questions as to instruction methodologies and purposes, including at what stage should L1 code switching, as a variance from *Standard American English* alone, be used educationally for the English language learner; and on the basis of what variety of purposes and manner of instruction.

The Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project will be to research and review the uses of code switching for instruction by teachers as a part of classroom interaction when teaching English as a second or foreign language. Specifically, this project will address issues raised and results achievable through instruction with and on code switching for learners of English as a foreign or second language. More particularly, this project will address code switching as both a teaching and learning strategy in order to accomplish communicative competence in the second language learner, especially the grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic competences as laid out by Canale and Swain (1980).

This project is intended for use by English as a second or foreign language instructors as a guidebook for the uses of code switching for the purposes of beginning learners in English language instruction. Application of code switching in classes which do not share a same L1 creates problems, as some of the students – even if few in number – will be negatively neglected. Therefore, all students should share that same L1 language.

The project will take the form of a functional manual for uses of code switching in teaching English as a second or foreign language as well as style shifting parameters. The project will focus its review on research into the efficacy of and guidelines for use of code switching, with respect to both (a) the instructor and (b) the student, neither of

whom may always be aware of functions and outcomes of the code switching process. These functions include, for example, equivalence, floor-holding, conflict control, reiteration, and topic switch. Examples of the uses for each of these functions will be provided when appropriate within the specific function category.

In developing introductory relations between the use and functions of code switching in foreign language classrooms, one must keep in mind that the language classroom is a social group, and a phenomenon related to naturally occurring daily discourse of any social group has the potential to be applicable to and valid for any language classroom. In conclusion, this project suggests the need for teachers to engage in continued consciousness raising as both code switching and style shifting are realities both inside and, moreover, outside the English language classroom itself.

Theoretical Framework

In their often-cited article on communicative competence in relation to second language pedagogy, Canale and Swain (1980) proposed a theoretical framework, whose purpose was to first outline the underlying systems of knowledge and skill required for communication (Canale, 1983) and set out the contents and boundaries of three areas of communicative competence: (1) grammatical, (2) sociolinguistic, and (3) strategic competence. In 1983, Canale further divided sociolinguistic competence into two separate components: (2a) sociolinguistic and (2b) discourse competence. Canale and Swain's intention was to discover the kinds of knowledge and skills that an L2 learner needs to be taught and to then develop the theoretical basis for a communicative approach in second language teaching which could be based on an understanding of the nature of human communication (Canale & Swain, 1980). In addition, their framework indicates

the rules that an L2 learner must learn for accumulation of knowledge and skills to become communicatively competent in the use of the target language; these rules are *not* confined to systematic rules of grammar only but are also applied to *all* aspects of a language. Since this framework of communicative competence was first put forward in detail, there have been numerous studies in order to both (1) analyze it more comprehensively and employ it in second language acquisition research, as well as (2) determine its effects on L2 learners. (Canale & Swain, 1980; *see also, e.g.*, Bachman & Palmer, 1982; Canale, 1983; Kasper & Rose, 2002; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Skehan, 1995; Swain, 1985; Tarone & Yule, 1989; Widdowson, 1978)

While second language teaching methodology over the past half century has moved from a sole focus on grammatical competence and justifiably incorporated sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence as a framework to develop actual L2 communication in and by second language students, this development has been coupled with disfavor of L1 language use by both teachers and students for classroom purposes. However, code switching has undergone a resurgence in the views of many researchers consistently showing benefits which indeed can be obtained by its use for the beginning-intermediate level students. These uses range from explanation, introduction and summarizing new material concepts to checking, assuring and testing comprehension to helping students feel more comfortable, confident and even simply joking around in the classroom environment.

Significance of the Project

Bilingual and multilingual individuals regularly make use of their language repertoires as a representation of relations and differences in expressing their ideas,

emotions, and identities. Additionally, this range of repertoire and mix of languages provides subtle and complex ways of conveying their ideas, emotions and identities. It is readily acknowledged that there is *no clear dividing line* between code switching and style shifting since, from the outset, it is very difficult to determine as an initial matter what counts as a “dialect” of a language versus a “language” in its own right. (See, e.g. Wolfram & Schilling, 2015; Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015; Haugen, 1966). Thus variations of style around the world do and will continue to provide the potential for limitless combinations and expectations, so that English learners already encounter an increasing range of interaction styles as to the speaking and understanding of English on a daily basis (Nat’l Council of Teachers of Eng., 2008).

A multilingual teaching model is therefore more in keeping with today’s world: The most important role that English now plays in today’s world is as a lingua franca. It is adopted as the common language of communication by bilingual and multilingual people for whom English is not a first language, and indeed the greatest majority of communication in English is between people who come from non-English backgrounds. *With many more L2 speakers of English than L1 speakers of English*, the variability of English code switching has continued and will continue to exponentially increase, and thus students still entirely or relatively new to English language learning and exposure will find use in advanced recognition of these parameters as an assistance to and intrinsic part of the English language learning experience (Swain, Kirkpatrick & Cummins, 2011).

The allowance, use and application of code switching as a part of the EFL instruction process itself from the outset of the learning process recognizes the students and their own language background, assists in instruction methodology and achievement,

and ultimately provides students with a representation of real-life grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic differences. Thus English instructors are enabled to teach the students in a most realistic and effective manner for increased advancement of the students' English language abilities in the modern world.

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

[T]here is neither a persuasive body of research nor satisfying empirical work indicating that abandoning or allowing the use of L1 in EFL classrooms would better contribute to students' learning of a L2 (Swain et al., 2011).

Introduction

Over the past century, second language teaching methodology has moved from a focus solely on grammatical competence and incorporated sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence as a part of the framework of actual second language communication. Yet much like an allegorical pendulum swing, this advancement was also supported in part by a pervasive disfavor of any classroom L1 use by the teacher and students. The rule became “English Only.”

In the past few decades, classroom L1 code switching has undergone a resurgence in the views of many researchers. There is consistently increasing recognition that L1 use does provide a range of benefits for L2 teaching. At the beginning-intermediate levels, L1 code switching can aid in more rapidly advancing L2 instruction by providing support across the full range of classroom factors. As will be further reviewed in this and the following chapters, these include introduction, explanation, and summarization of new material; checking, assuring and testing comprehension; and helping students feel more comfortable, more confident, and even simply joking around in the classroom environment.

The Development of ELT Pedagogy

“English Only”

The monolingual “English Only” approach has by no means always been the norm in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages, with regard to both overseas teaching of English as a foreign language as well as the teaching of English as a second language as practiced within the United States (*see, e.g.*, Baron, 1990; Crawford, 1991). Indeed, it is worthy of note at the outset that in American education policies there have always been cyclical fluctuations, and, more often than not, these were ultimately determined by political rather than pedagogical factors. The decentralized and locally controlled structure of 19th century public schooling purposefully allowed for local bilingual education in accordance with the political power – and, accordingly, language orientation – of a region’s particular ethnic composition (Auerbach, 1993).

A resurgence of nativism and antiforeign political sentiment at the turn of the 20th century led to a decline of localized bilingual education and, following the onset of World War I, the urban confluence of the increased immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe, along with a significant role in the nascent labor movement, contributed to an increasingly xenophobic atmosphere (Crawford, 1991). That period’s Americanization movement thus gained momentum and placed the blame for the nation’s political and economic problems on foreign influences. As a result, it well behooved a worker to demonstrate loyalty to both company and country by learning English as a second language (Baron, 1990).

It was in this environment that the “English Only” classroom policy developed, with its central doctrine to encourage learners to use L2 English as the sole means of

interaction with teachers and peers. In turn, there was widespread discrediting of the grammar-translation method, which included casting off contrastive analysis in language teaching (Atkinson, 1987), and the rise in popularity of the direct method, with exclusive L2 use presumably maximizing target code exposure and thus maximizing learning (Eldridge, 1996; Sampson, 2012).

Thus, “English Only” became the norm *sine qua non* of American ESL classes (Baron, 1990), with adult ESL instruction over the first several decades of the twentieth century placing increased focus more exclusively on practical English, such as lessons to open a bank account, visit a doctor, ask directions, make purchases, and show gratitude. The pedagogical guidelines of Henry Goldberger, a teacher within the NYC Public School system, provide a well-known example of this nascent ESL teaching methodology. Goldberger advised that English should be the sole medium of instruction and warned that, when grouping students, teachers are “to prevent the formation of ‘national cliques’ which would delay the work of Americanization” (Baron, 1990, p. 160).

The teacher selection process became restricted by formalized gate-keeping practices, such as citizenship requirements as well as of speech and pronunciation tests for teacher licensing, for the purpose of promoting U.S. values and excluding foreigners from the ranks of the teaching profession (Auerbach, 1993). According to Baron (1990), country of origin and a native language background were more important as ESL teaching qualifications than training: “As a result of these efforts to homogenize the language of the teaching corps, schoolteachers remained by and large monolingual

English speakers untrained in any methodology to teach English to non-anglophones and unable to empathize with the non-anglophone student” (p. 162).

It has been noted that “English Only,” which would continue as a central premise in communicative language teaching over ensuing decades of the mid-twentieth century (Meiring and Norman, 2002; Butzkamm, 2003), also proved a convenient methodology for the increasing number of native English-speaking teachers venturing abroad to seek work in English language instruction with very limited or no command of the learners’ L1 (Macaro 2005: 65), as well as for ELT publishers mass-producing English Only coursebooks for use in the wide range of international contexts (Butzkamm, 2003; Sampson, 2012). Thus, most teaching methods since the 1880s have adopted a Direct Method avoidance of the LI. According to Howatt (1984, p. 289), “the monolingual principle, the unique contribution of the twentieth century to classroom language teaching, remains the bedrock notion from which the others ultimately derive.”

By way of other examples outside of the American context, Phillipson (1992) reviewed commonly held assumptions about ELT methodology arising under *British* neocolonial policies at the close of the 20th century, and he similarly claims that the development of ELT as a profession was itself a direct response to political imperative. The English language was seen as a key infrastructure component of British neocolonial control and, as such, funding for ELT was generously afforded in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Practices which one takes for granted as being pedagogically grounded have historical roots in what can be considered overtly ideological tendencies – with the notable difference that, at that time, the political agenda was certainly the more explicit impetus behind “English Only” in the ESL classroom.

Code switching

Redouane (2005) indicates that the earliest definition of code switching dates back to Weinreich (1953), who defined bilingual individuals as persons who switch from a language to another based on proper changes in the speech situation. By the 1980s, code switching was receiving attention as a specific phenomenon and strategy of foreign language teachers (Shay, 2015). In 1980, Poplack noted that code switching, in the broad context sometimes alternatively called “code mixing”, “code changing” or “code shifting,” is the act of alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence, or constituent. In the mid-1990s, researchers started placing an increased focus on the ways in which code switching could contribute to the interactional work between teachers and students in United States bilingual classrooms. The earliest code switching studies primarily investigated the functions of code switching in the speech of bilingual teachers and the frequency with which some languages, usually English or Spanish, were employed to perform different functions (Martin-Jones, 1995). Since then, researchers broadened the scope of examination into a greater range of issues to include L1 use as a part of L2 instruction and expanded the geographic range to bilingual or multilingual educational contexts around the world (Greggio & Gil, 2007).

Yet there have been periods in the past when L1 avoidance was not seen as a self-evident truth, and a minority of people in every period have rejected it (Cook, 2001). Since the end of the twentieth century, there has indeed developed an ongoing debate requiring closer examination of the issue of whether switching back and forth between the target L2 and native L1 in a L2 classroom is helpful or impeding (Jingxia, 2010; Shay, 2015). In 1985, for example, Wong-Fillmore concluded that learners used to

hearing the teacher use the L1 tended to ignore the L2 and, therefore, failed to fully benefit from valuable L2 input. With increasing review over the decades, some scholars have continued to argue that the L2 should be taught using the L2 exclusively and teachers should focus on creating a pure foreign language environment, as they are the sole linguistic models for the students (*e.g.* Chaudron, 1988; Lightbown, 2001).

Lightbown (2001) defined code switching as “the systematic alternating use of two languages or language varieties within a single conversation or utterance” (p.598).

However, Lightbown – specialized in second language acquisition – favored an intralingual method as a teaching strategy and believed that exposure to the target language (L2) only would help learners achieve success, with the teachers being responsible for creating this pure foreign language environment. Further, noted by Lightbown, code switching would only lead to negative transfer in learning the L2 foreign language.

In addition, these authors claimed that students did not need to understand everything that was said to them by the teacher, and code switching might result in negative transfer in foreign language learning. These authors are of the opinion that switching to the L1 undermines the process of learning, whereas teaching entirely through the L2 has numerous benefits such as making the language real and allowing learners to experience unpredictability. In 2010, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) recommended that “language educators and their students use the target language as exclusively as possible (90% plus) at all levels of instruction during instructional time and, when feasible, beyond the classroom” (ACTFL, 2010, p. 1). ACTFL’s recommendation is supported by an established body of research

about the effectiveness of exclusive, or almost exclusive, use of the target language in supporting students' progress toward proficiency in a second language.

Limitations

Krashen (1985) had insisted that the students' L1 should not be used in the classroom so as to maximize the exposure of the target language. As we have seen, research data accumulating since that time reveals a positive attitude by students towards the use of L1 in classrooms in the form of code switching with the caveat that excessive use of code switching can become detrimental to the development of acquiring L2 language skills. In deviating students from the lecture, a teachers' code switching does tend to distracting and thus there is a need for caution in classroom L1 use.

The potential for undesirable outcomes of overuse have been cited and a number of examples follow. As an initial matter, the students view English as an important L2 language, and the EFL classroom may be the only place where the students have an opportunity to learn, and improve, their command of the English language.

Rather than learning to think in L2, the students' L2 thinking skills may be called into question by relying on translation from L1 to L2, with the students feeling that they have not "really" understood any item of language until it has been translated. A study by Tsukamoto (2012) in Japan found that students had a negative perception of teachers' code switching with the potential to hinder L2 acquisition. Code switching by the teacher affected the students' perceived fluency of lecture and broke the momentum which was required for more complete L2 understanding on the part of the students.

The teacher and/or the students may fail to adequately observe the distinctions between equivalence of form, semantic equivalence, and pragmatic features, and thus

oversimplify to the point of using crude and inaccurate translations. Commentary has viewed the teachers' switching code as affecting the fluency of the lecture and breaking the momentum required for understanding on the part of the students. Code switching by the teacher in the classroom can deprive students of opportunities to improve their L2 listening skills. Respondents opined that this may directly and negatively influence the language of the students – especially weakening the domains of speaking, listening and vocabulary.

Students may fail to realize that during many activities in the classroom it is essential that they use only the subject L2, with students instead speaking to the teacher in the L1 mother tongue as a matter of course even when they are quite capable of expressing what they mean in the L2. Code switching thus leads to a negative impact on not only the students' linguistic skill but also affective traits as, for example, students find it difficult to face a general L2 audience because of less exposure to the L2. (*See, e.g., Atkinson, 1987; Holthouse, 2002; Fareed, 2016*)

Benefits

In 1999, Cook observed that “Methodologists’ insistence on the L2 does not mean that the L1 has not *in practice* been used in most classrooms” (Cook, 1999 at p. 200 (italics added)). The position was summed up in Cook’s opinion as follows:

[A] door ... has been firmly shut in language teaching for over a hundred years ... however the assumption is phrased, the L2 is seen as positive, the L1 as negative ... recent methods do not so much forbid the L1 as ignore its existence ... most teaching manuals take the avoidance of the L1 as so obvious that no classroom use of the L1 is ever mentioned (Cook, 2001).

Furthermore, as Cook asserted, this position “has prevented language teaching from looking rationally at ways in which the L1 can be involved in the classroom” (p. 410).

The proscription against classroom use was indeed breaking down, with increased recognition that some learners use the L1 as a communicative strategy to learn and use the L2 target. In this way, it recognized language use as a meaning-making tool and language learning as a means of communicating *ideas* rather than an end in itself. At this initial stage in reopening the investigation into applications of L1 code switching, Piasecka (1986) explained as follows:

... [T]eaching bilingually does not mean a return to the Grammar Translation method, but rather a standpoint which accepts that the thinking, feeling, and artistic life of a person is very much rooted in their mother tongue. If the communicative approach is to live up to its name, then there are many occasions in which the original impulse to speak can only be found in the mother tongue. At the initial stages of learning a new language, the students' repertoire is limited to those few utterances already learnt and they must constantly think before speaking. When having a conversation, we often become fully aware of what we actually mean only after speaking. We need to speak in order to sort out our ideas, and when learning a new language this is often best done through the mother tongue. (p. 97)

Thus, from the 1900s forward, there arose an increasingly positive change towards recognition and productive analysis of L1 use (and translation) in L2 instruction (Cook, 2001; Gill, 2003; James, 1998; Odlin 1989). In 1996, Eldridge commented that code switching was “a natural and purposeful phenomenon which facilitates both communication and learning” (at p. 310), commonly observed when speakers from differing L1 backgrounds (or even the same L1 background) use an L2 in real life situations, and as is witnessed with infinite variety every day in communities throughout the world. The pedagogical underpinnings attracted more interest with the result that predominantly socio-psycholinguistic aspects of code switching were increasingly investigated (Martin-Jones, 1995; Flyman and Burenhult, 1999; Macaro, 2001; Seidlitz, 2003; Greggio and Gil, 2007).

The new concurrent method, one example of new teaching methods deliberately using L1 in teaching EFL, appeared and required teachers to balance the use of the L1 and the L2 (Faltis, 1990). For this purpose, L1 use was considered acceptable in four areas: introducing concepts; reviewing a previous lesson; capturing learners' attention; and praising them. As research continued, it became evident that in addition to the potential for negative language transfer, there was also concurrent, positive transfer. Indeed, this was most evident whenever L2 learners might benefit from being exposed to the similarities of the two respective languages.

Vivian Cook (2001) outlined the predominant “monolingual principle” of 20th century L2 instruction, namely the “L2 Only” classroom, and countered that the prevailing motivations offered in support of a virtual L2 environment still did not preclude a role for the L1 in the classroom (Cook, 2001, p. 404; *see also* Levine, 2003; Macaro, 2001). Indeed, Cook provided the following specific situations where L1 use would be appropriate: to check meanings of words and explain grammar; to organize tasks and give directions, to maintain discipline; to administer tests; and to organize and carry out classroom group activities.

In 2007, linguist Guy Cook noted, “The ESL classroom cannot follow the motto ‘One nation, one people, one language’.” The importance is highlighted even more by the fact that the students’ culture is part of their L1 language and by neglecting that language, the teacher, in a monolingual classroom, neglects the culture and leads to a danger of neglecting the students’ identity as well. What is more, it still remains to be the case that no valid database can confirm a standpoint that the monolingual approach in

teaching is the best one. In fact, the disregard of the students' mother tongue can result in de-motivating the students and thus be counterproductive to the L2 teaching process.

Another revealing fact is that many of the advocates for L1 usage, including those cited herein, are from outside the United States – namely, from Canada, Australia, and England – all countries where multiculturalism rather than English Only is stressed in the wider political and policy context. Indeed, language education professionals in these countries expressed surprise that using the L1 in ESL classes could be considered controversial in the U.S., and they indicate that they encourage students to use their L1 since teacher evaluation is based in part on the extent to which the students' cultures and languages are valued in the classroom (Collingham, 1988). As such, monolingual ESL instruction is by no means the “taken-for-granted” norm everywhere in the world. And the fact that so many of the studies exploring the use of the L1 are published outside the United States adds to a conclusion that monolingual approaches to ESL may be more ideologically than pedagogically rooted.

Rather than placing focus on how code switchers themselves saw the phenomenon of code switching, however, researchers continued to place principal interest on its pedagogical implications in the L2 environment. For example, Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) recorded their observation of Turkish students' code switched utterances in relation to both pause length for answering a question in the L2 and the use of teacher-induced and teacher-initiated code switching as encouragement for students to turn back to the L2. Üstünel and Seedhouse concluded that learners' language choice was related to their degree of alignment or disalignment with the teacher's pedagogy, with learners tending to code switch when engaged in interaction differing from the

teacher's intended focus at that stage of the lesson, such as when learners need to deal with procedural issues (*see also* Horasan, 2014).

With linguistic globalization in today's world of modern technology and communication means, most of the world's speech communities are becoming multilingual (to the extent not so already). And just as code switching is widely observed in the bilingual, multilingual, and multicultural communities themselves (Chung, 2006), by now it is becoming more often recognized that, despite earlier misgivings, code switching is in fact widely observed in foreign language classrooms (Sert, 2005). This is of course dependent on the linguistic backgrounds of the students and teachers engaged in the second language teaching and learning process.

Oftentimes despite a lack of equivalent proficiency levels in each language, code switching speakers' ability to communicate in their L1 as well as one or more other languages, to whatever the degree, readily differentiates them from monolingual speakers (Iyitoglu, 2016). As Jacobson had recognized in the broadest of terms in 1976, code switching provided individual bilingual speakers with the potential to cope with the whole universe of experience through the two language media: "Therefore, it is no small wonder that they not only switch from one language to another as they move between situations but at times they also do so within the same situation and even within the same sentence" (p. 3).

The debate over use of code switching in L2 instruction has pivoted around a number of points but has increasingly centered on the overarching dichotomy between the method of total immersion compared against the practicalities of real world multilingual usage. For example, Krashen and Terrell (1983) explained that the natural

approach is “based on the use of the language in communicative situations without recourse to the use of the native language” (p. 9). Yet, as later observed by Cook (2001), their choice of the word “recourse” is only indicative of a certain amount of stigma associated with any L1 use within the communicative L2 classroom. Indeed, in 1995 Krashen further stressed that the students’ L1 should not be used under any circumstances in the classroom so as to maximize exposure to the target language.

It remains indisputable that the more that students can receive and incorporate L2 exposure, the faster the students may learn the L2 (Ellis, 2015). However, successive research studies over these past few decades have been opening up the L1 limitation. As Lanziti explained in 2002 at the outset of this recent research trend, advocates of the exclusive use of the target language were beginning to lose ground, with most researchers adopting a position favoring the more tolerant approach to L1 use under the belief that it does play a positive role for L2 learning. The logic behind this idea was succinctly stated by Cook in a 1999 study:

Although the practical issue of diverse L1s requires the consistent use of the L2 in multilingual classes, this restriction should not apply to those classes where the students share a common L1. L2 users have the L1 permanently present in their minds. Every activity the students carry out visibly in the L2 also involves the invisible L1. The apparent L2 nature of the classroom covers up the presence of the L1 in the minds of the students. (Cook, 1999, at p. 202)

As already noted above, education researchers became increasingly aware of the fact that monolingual ESL instruction in the United States had had as much to do with politics as with pedagogy, with roots traced to the political and economic interests of dominant groups in the same way that the English Only movement had been (Auerbach, 1993). Moreover, the rationale and research supporting this conclusion were now called into

question given an increasing development of evidence which indicated that L1 and/or bilingual options were not only effective but could even be considered as necessary for adult ESL students with limited L1 and schooling backgrounds. Thus, the accumulated body of practice and research pointed towards a need to expend much greater resources in exploring L1 literacy or bilingual ESL program models for these learners.

In a 2003 review of teacher feedback on the issue, Gill supported the proposition that learner-centeredness be “more than a fashionable buzzword” with comments made by L2 instructors on code switching use, which included that “we must remember that the decision in favor of a lifelong acquisition of L2 is a student’s prerogative, not a teacher’s mandate”, “trying to eliminate L1 in the L2 classroom when the students share the same L1 seems very artificial”, “one aspect of this question is the degree to which attempting to over-control natural human behaviour becomes a form of infantilizing adult learners”, and “[the no-L1] rule bottles up questions which should be asked, closes off the most obvious channel of communication between learners who share a mother tongue, and puts all the power into the teacher’s hands.” (pp. 3-4)

Thus the majority of current research now increasingly indicates beneficial results obtained with limited L1 use, with the educational level of the students playing a most important role to determine the effectiveness of code-switching as a learning strategy (*see, e.g.* Afzal, 2013; Bouangeune, 2009; Dujmovic, 2007; Kovacic & Kirinic, 2011; Rodrigues & Oxbrow, 2008; Spahiu, 2013). For beginners and low-proficiency learners, again by way of introductory example, code switching is now increasingly considered an effective strategy to learn, but for intermediate level students more target language input is required and therefore code switching is not approved or liked by lecturers and students

(Ling et al., 2014; Jingxia, 2010; Yao, 2011; Horasan, 2014). In sum, the past decade has shown a consistent trend towards the allowance of code switching into students' L1 for the purposes of L2 instruction

In 2012, Sampson regarded the management of different languages in EFL classes as calling for “a *common-sense approach* where exploitation of L1 is counterbalanced with efforts to teach communicative functions in L2” (p. 133 [italics added]). Gil, Garau and Noguera (2012) further noted that, in the context of a global society, multilingualism has become the norm rather than the exception – even in communities that are officially considered to be monolingual (Cenoz, 2011). This situation has led to the increase of language contact and code switching. Since classrooms are supposed to mirror the real world, this multilingual perspective should progressively enter the educational system (Cenoz 2011). This approach to foreign language teaching “looks at the different languages as a whole and explores their commonalities. It creates connections between the languages being learned at school by using translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy” (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011, at p. 360 [footnote omitted]). However, despite advancement of the position that code-switching can, and should, serve as an important scaffolding strategy to assist learners in immersion programs (Gearon, 2011; Sampson, 2012), it is equally noted that in real practice in schools this often remains not to be put in practice. As typified by Gearon (2011), “immersion education has generally been characterised by an emphasis on consistent and constant use of the target language by teachers and students” (p. 39).

The L2 Classroom: Teacher and Student

The use of code switching in the L2 classroom does raise questions pertaining to teaching methodology, such as which L1 uses should be selected and integrated into classroom practices; which uses should continue to be banned; and what grounds does the teacher use in deciding which code-switching practices are permissible and which ones are not? (Iyitoglu, 2016) Code switching may be observed as a part of either the teacher's, or the student's, classroom discourse. Therefore, it is necessary to have at least an understanding of the functions of switching between the native and the foreign language and its underlying reasons (Sert, 2005). As Sert observed, the incorporation of these considerations will raise language teachers' awareness of L2 classroom use, which "will obviously lead to better instruction by either eliminating it or dominating its use during the foreign language instruction" (Sert, 2005, p. 1).

To better understand teachers' and students' use of English in the foreign language classroom over the past few decades, there have been a number of researchers who have developed categories for analyzing when and for what purposes each language was used (Rolin-Ianziti & Varshney, 2008; Thompson, 2014). Moreover, research into these issues has been conducted in both the EFL context (*see, e.g.*, Ahlberg & Bogunic, 2011 (Sweden); Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009 (Malaysia); Azlan & Narasuman 2013; Bahous, Nabhani, & Bacha, 2014 (Lebanon); Barandagh, Zoghi, & Amini, 2013 (Iran); Bensen & Cavusoglu, 2013 (Cyprus); Greggio & Gil, 2007 (Brasil); Hobbs, Matsuo, & Payne, 2004 (Japan); Horasan, 2014 (Turkey); Iyitoglu, 2016 (Croatia); Jingxia, 2010 (China); Macaro, 2001 (France); Reini, 2008 (Iran); Sali, 2014 (Turkey); Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005 (Turkey); Yao, 2011 (China); Yataganbaba & Yildirim, 2015 (Turkey); Yletyinen,

2004 (Finland) as well as the ESL context (*see, e.g.*, Anderson & Toribio, 2007 (USA); Fareed, Humayun & Akhtar, 2016 (Pakistan)).

Gill (2003) lays out the use or rejection of L1 code switching as a spectrum, at one end of which are those teachers rejecting the use of L1 altogether and/or failing to recognize any significant potential in it, at the other end are those who either massively overuse it themselves and/or are willing to accept such overuse from their students. Either extreme, in its own, abuses a resource with great potential and delicacy.

It is extremely important to note that there are, of course, classrooms where there are ten first languages represented, none of which the teacher speaks to any degree, especially in ESL contexts within English speaking countries such as the United States, Great Britain, etc., and in which context code switching with regard to certain students' L1 in derogation of other students who do not share that language is uniformly considered detrimental. However, globally these settings are massively outnumbered by the EFL context where the teacher and learners all share the same L1, and it is largely towards this latter context that further discussion is aimed.

In 1993 Atkinson had observed that most learners of English were found in monolingual (EFL) classes, where all of the students shared a common L1 other than English. Atkinson further explained that such classes have their own special characteristics, and approaches which work well with multilingual groups of students are not always so successful with monolingual groups. By 1997, Weschler deemed that any assumption that the English-only, direct method could be applied equally well to any size and type of class and any level or content of language was "simply false" (p. 4). And according to Weschler (1997), this fallacy was most clearly evident when an English-

only policy was blindly transplanted from an ESL to an EFL environment. Weschler concluded that here was no reason why a teacher should not take advantage of the classroom students' shared knowledge in order to bridge the gap to what they do not yet know.

Particularly, a code switch often contextualizes a change of “frame” away from lesson content and toward some “off-record” concern — to discipline pupils, to attend to latecomers, to gain and focus pupils’ attentions (Goffman, 1974). It may also demarcate talk about the lesson content from what we may refer to as the management of pupil learning; that is, negotiating task instructions, eliciting pupil responses, disciplining students, specifying a particular addressee, and so on. With regard to the following five question items in relation to classroom management, five aspects of use of code-switching are presented to the teachers (Yao, 2011).

The question thus becomes not how much L1 should be used, but how appropriately it could be used and how it could be best used to foster learning of the L2 target language – and here, it is pointed out, it is the teaching method which most often requires adjustment and not the language of instruction. As set forth by Atkinson (1993) in simplest terms: “Teachers should use English where possible and L1 where necessary. We can perhaps say that the questions which teachers need to ask themselves are: Can I justify using the L1 here? Will it help the students’ learning more than using English would?” (p. 1; *see also* Weschler, 1997) In 2000, Rao Zhenhui readily summed up the current conclusion that “the best solution is to make limited use of students’ native language at appropriate times and in appropriate places.” However, it is worth emphasizing the word “limited.”

In 2003, Deller and Rinvoluturi released a collection of practical classroom ideas addressing the roles which the mother tongue assists, and it appears that this has been the sole workbook publication issued on the subject. It is presented in a user-friendly “recipe” format and provides a practical springboard. Nonetheless, the practical focus of the book lacks any broader overview of the status of research into classroom L1 use, in order to both expand from that explicit framework upon L1 uses in the classroom for the teacher to incorporate, and equally delimit the roles of L1 use based upon observed limitations and drawbacks.

Teacher code switching

As an initial matter, teacher code switching is appropriate when compliance with the local educational tradition suggests it – this is a point explicitly made by Rao Zhenhui (2000) as relevant to the notions of “appropriate pedagogy” of the last several decades. The most often cited reason for teacher code-switching from L2 to L1 has historically been in order to *facilitate the understanding of grammatical structures and rules during grammar instruction*. The teacher shifts the language of instruction back from the L2 to the students’ L1 mother tongue in order to most effectively deal with particular grammar points which are being specifically taught at that moment (Gill, 2003; Greggio and Gil, 2007; Sert, 2005). A noteworthy concern in the presentation of L2 grammar and language rules is that meta-language is frequently a lot more complex than what it is being used to describe. Some classroom teaching materials may rely on the learner knowing a range of meta-language and the teacher must factor in time spent in teaching learners some of the more common of these terms. L1 use can smooth the path for

introduction of these terms, avoiding unnecessary terminology in L2 until reaching a later, more appropriate stage for instruction on the particular grammatical topic.

Code switching is also performed by the teacher as a *repetitive function* wherein the L1 is used as a resource for L2 learning including the facilitation of task management. (Cipriani, 2001, *as cited in* Greggio & Gil, 2007). With this reason in mind, Sert (2005) has explained that the teacher may use code switching to transfer necessary knowledge to the students in order to confirm clarity for purposes of the lesson. Following the instruction in the L2 target language, the teacher code switches to the L1 native language in order to clarify meaning and assure efficient comprehension. However, Sert also warns that this tendency to repeat the instruction in the native language may result in demotivating the learner to listen to the instruction in L2.

Greggio and Gil (2007) investigated the oral participation strategies of a beginner group and observed that the teacher made use of code switching in order to clarify vocabulary and communicate tasks. As Baker (2001) indicated, “teachers in the classroom explain a concept in one language, and then explain it again in another language, believing that repetition (in both languages) adds reinforcement and completeness of understanding” (Baker, 2001, p. 5, *as cited in* Wang, 2007).

For beginning stages of L2 instruction, code switching is also frequently cited as a means to *establish effective communication and trigger oral participation between both teacher and learners*. For example, Moore (2002) generally noted the usefulness of code switching where the observed teacher’s focus was on making sure that learners understood and were able to reconstruct a story which the teacher had told. The students were not scolded for use of their first language and, in fact, were encouraged to do so as

not to break the flow of conversation. This effectively recognizes and incorporates each L1 utterance as part of the overall exchange, capable when required so as to add to it rather than restrict it. Following further along these lines, Greggio and Gil's study (2007) observed code switching as an early strategy in order to trigger oral participation between both teacher and learners. The studies of both Ahmad & Jusoff (2009) and Selamat (2014) relayed respondents' statements that a teacher's use of code switching makes the lecture interactive for the students and enables the teacher to build rapport with the students. Furthermore, these studies identified respective data indicating that the teachers' code switching to L1 did not attribute any negative impact on their view of the teacher's own proficiency in English, did not obstruct the students' understanding of the lecture but rather made the students more comfortable, and thus strengthened students' interest in and acquisition of English rather than weakened it.

The affective function of code switching thus allows the teacher to build close and intimate relations with students and to create a supportive language environment in the classroom. And one further point raised in this regard is that code switching provides a means not only in creating this supportive language environment in the classroom, but also includes maintaining discipline when needed depending on the classroom structure (Zabrodjkaja, 2007). For example, in her study on the issue of code-switching in the university classroom and the ways in which the alternate use of codes in relation to the learning and teaching process, Zabrodjkaja (2007) observed that the teacher shifted to L1 when it was necessary to either praise or tell off a student, such as using it in the latter regard in order to show the dissolute behavior of one of the students in cheating on a test.

Another example of advantageous use of code switching often cited is *topic change*, such as in the situation where a teacher changes the language of instruction, from L2 to L1, in accord with a change of topic under discussion (Mattson & Burenholt, 1999).

Student code switching

The term *equivalence* has been suggested as one of the most outstanding reasons for students' code switching (Eldridge, 1996). The student makes use of the native equivalent of a certain lexical item in the target language and therefore continues the code switch into L1 as a means of further communication. A deficiency in linguistic competence of the target language makes the student use the native lexical item when the student is not yet competent to using the target language explanation for this particular lexical item (Sert, 2005). In this fashion, equivalence simply stands for the functions of a defensive mechanism of students, and accordingly may be referred to as *deficiency in L2 linguistic competence*. With regard to this issue, Greggio and Gil (2007) explained that learners in a beginner group were observed to use extensive code switching in class while pre-intermediate learners used minimum code switching. As an illustration, Greggio and Gil provide the example of a beginner group learner talking about her hometown, who was found to switch to L1 when she did not know how to express herself in English.

MacSwan (1999) provided another, instructive comparison:

Judgments about vocabulary size can often be misguided, as they frequently turn on individual differences in interest and facility in talking about particular topics. That the Masai of modern Tanzania do not have a ready command of the *topic* of French homelife does not indicate a lack of proficiency in Masai, just as a Parisian's inability to readily discuss Tanzanian cattle herding techniques does not indicate a lack of proficiency in French. We naturally expect this difference in vocabulary, given the differences in experience. (p. 14)

The second function in students' code-switching is *reiteration* for the clarification of grammatical structures or knowledge about some topic. As Eldridge (1996) stressed, this is the situation in which "messages are reinforced, emphasized, or clarified where the message has already been transmitted in one code, but not understood" (p. 306). This function may also be stated as *clarifying grammatical structures or knowledge about some topic*. In this case, the learner repeats the same message from the target language in L1 to clarify the meaning. McKinley and Sakamoto (2007) aimed to explore the reasons for code switching among Japanese students majoring in English, and the person being communicated with was found to be a primary reason for students' code switching on this basis.

A next function of student code switching is *floor-holding*, in which students switch to the L1 in order to avoid gaps in communication (Sert, 2005). This is claimed to result from the lack of fluency in the target language and, according to Sert (2005), learners who perform code switching for floor holding usually experience the same problem. Sert explains that in these circumstances students cannot remember the suitable target language structure or vocabulary. To support this function, Wang (2006) conducted a study in order to explore the driving factors and utterance features of code switching of bilingual (Mandarin and English) students in English-dominant environments. Based on the results of the study it may be concluded that one in two Chinese postgraduate students, having a conversation in the library, used "*You know*" as a tag switching and then the other student used the alternate word *assignment* in his Chinese-dominant sentence since he lacked knowledge to explain it in Chinese. He had learned this term in the English context and he could not find the corresponding Chinese code with which to

replace it. However, just like the former student he code switched to maintain the flow of conversation.

It has been observed that most of a learner's code switching may be claimed to ultimately result from continuing *linguistic incompetence*, and therefore this term may likely cover most of the functions expressed above. Indeed, Wang (2006) provides the example of this function in a learner to learner interaction wherein a Mandarin-English bilingual asked a Chinese classmate for an English word, "*Hi, how can I say hua xue in English?*" (Hi, how can I say *chemistry* in English?). In this case, L1 Chinese was thus found to be the linguistic aid used to improve the speakers' English.

The last function of a student's code switching for preliminary introduction here is the *cultural* basis. Wang (2006) has presented a number of examples of cultural reasons for switching from English to Chinese. For example, a Chinese student introducing Chinese cultures to his British tutor in English switched to Mandarin to enable the Chinese cultural value to be exactly described when citing the names of people or particular Chinese traditions. Similarly, many bilinguals address their family seniors in the L1 as a way of reinforcing traditional relationship. For instance, A switched from English to Chinese in the conversation with his aunt B (A: Happy Birthday, *gugu* (aunt). B: *Xie xie, bao beir.* (Thanks, my love.)) In this fashion, the speaker was able to show respect to his aunt since the Chinese word is accepted as more respectful among family members.

Handling obstacles to L2 use

Proper and judicious L1 use is thus recognized as a needful, and worthy, pedagogical ally in the teaching and learning of English dependent on the proper setting. Going one step further, where teacher and learners do all share the same first language or

national language, it will of course be equally incumbent upon the teacher to encourage learners to use the L2 as much as possible (Nation 2001). As summarized in the above review, there is a wide range of reasons for learner L1 use, both advantageous and disadvantageous to the learning process. The latter include low proficiency in the L2, the naturalness of using the L2 to do certain jobs, shyness in using the L2, or simply a lack of interest in learning the L2. In order to handle such obstacles to L2 use, the teacher ought be mindful to:

- (1) Choose manageable tasks that are within the learners' proficiency.
- (2) Prepare learners for tasks by pre-teaching the language items and skills needed.
- (3) Use staged and graded tasks that bring learners up to the level required.
- (4) Get learners to pretend to be English speakers.
- (5) Make the L2 an unavoidable part of the task. Retelling activities, strip stories, completion activities, and role plays all require the use of the L2.
- (6) Repeat tasks to make them easier.
- (7) Inform learners of the learning goals of each task so that they can see how using the L2 will help them achieve a clear short term learning goal.
- (8) Discuss with the learners the value of using the L2 in class.
- (9) Get learners to discuss the reasons why they avoid using the L2 and get them to suggest solutions to encourage L2 use.
- (10) Set up a monitoring system to remind learners to use the L2. In group work speaking tasks this can involve giving one learner in each group the role of reminding others to use the L2.
- (11) Use non-threatening tasks. Learners can choose their own groups, the teacher can stay out of the groups, allow learners to prepare well for the tasks, don't use tasks that put learners in embarrassing situations, and choose interesting, non-threatening topics. (Afzal, 2013)

A combination of several of these solutions may need to be used in order to

encourage L2 use. These solutions cover a range of affective, cognitive, and resource approaches and thus can be seen as complementary rather than as alternatives. As an overarching principal, the teacher must show respect for the learners' L1 and avoid making the L1 seem inferior to the classroom L2, while developing the students' L2 proficiency. In summary, a balanced approach is central to the role for the L1 while also recognizing the importance of maximizing L2 use in the classroom.

The Advanced L2 Student in A Multilingual World

For years every language in the curriculum was learnt in isolation from the other tongues and the shift from that L2 to the L1 in language classes was not generally allowed, because it was thought to weaken the learning of the L2 (Gil, Garau & Noguera, 2012). Yet the validity of code switching is now recognized as a strategy adopted by all multilingual speakers, who choose between one code or another according to the interlocutor, the situation, the topic, or the goal of the interaction (Costa 2009; Cenoz 2011). Monolingualism is certainly not the norm across the world (Evans 2010). It is a fact that bilingualism is present in practically every country of the world, in all classes of society, and in all age groups (Shay, 2015). Moreover, it is difficult to find a society that is genuinely monolingual, since bilingualism is a phenomenon that has existed since a very early stage of human history, and the history of languages is full of examples of language contact leading to some form of bilingualism (Grosjean, 2001).

At the worldwide level in today's age, it is also now widely acknowledged that English is the language most often used as a medium for communication between non-native speakers. From this notion of overlapping and shared abilities in L2 English use, a further assessment has developed: English now belongs to all those who use it

(Holthouse, 2002). For the majority of English users around the world, the (imagined) British and American versions of “standard” English are simply no longer the reference point for uses of the language (Canagarajah, 2006a, p. 589; *see also* Lee, 2014).

Since the languages and the boundaries across today’s increasingly globalized social structure are never fixed, the focus of language use is often conceded to be on intelligibility coupled with range rather than perceived fluency in use. In sum, the blending of languages is normal, all language use involves translation, and bilingualism is “a unique and shifting blend of practical knowledge and language use” (Horner, NeCamp, et al., 2011, p. 287). These form the main tenets of the translingual approach. As Horner, Lu, Royster & Trimbur (2011) explained, this approach in conjunction with the acceptance of code switching as a part of L2 instruction strategy “sees difference in language not as a barrier to overcome or as a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening” (p. 303).

In the outset of reassessment of L1 usage in the L2 classroom, Hemmindinger (1987), for example, identified use of the L1 as critical in implementing an empowering approach to ESL in her classes because it allowed students to discuss vital issues in their lives which they were then able to address in English. Hemmingdinger further explained that many of these programs support the approach to adult education set forth by Paulo Freire and others, in which curriculum content is drawn from participants' real life experiences and invites reflection on these experiences. On these grounds, a monolingual approach to ESL is rejected not just because it may slow the acquisition of English but because it denies learners the right to draw on their language resources and strengths. By forcing a focus on simplified, even childlike, uses of language and excluding the

possibility of critical reflection, it may ultimately feed into the replication of relations of inequality outside the classroom, reproducing a stratum of people who can only do the least skilled and least language/literacy-dependent jobs. Collingham (1988) also compared approaches and results:

To treat adult learners as if they know nothing of language is to accept the imbalance of power and so ultimately to collude with institutional racism; to adopt a bilingual approach and to value the knowledge that learners already have is to begin to challenge that unequal power relationship and, one hopes, thereby enable learners to acquire the skills and confidence they need to claim back more power for themselves in the world beyond the classroom. (p. 85)

In 1993, Auerbach summarized that many of those who advocate native language or bilingual approaches to adult ESL do so because they see language acquisition as intimately connected with addressing the problems learners face in their lives outside the classroom. She pointed out that the revealing aspects of these studies and programs were to only reinforce the notion that the question of language choice is, in essence, a question of ideology.

This relation forms a philosophical foundation for L1 code switching, in accord with current and practical real life uses. Taking a step back for a broader look at this issue, many of the advantages of code switching for the purpose of beginning-intermediate level L2 education become (or should have become) moot by the advanced level, leading to the conclusion that any L1 use should be or has been abandoned going forward.

As proposed by Kracht (2014), any community of bilingual or multilingual speakers shows code switching to a great extent, and therefore we are led to assume that there is a uniform language faculty that is somehow metalinguistic and seemingly

independent of any particular language. Continuing along as proposed, we need not even look far for confirmation that things have to be so, as there are a number of phenomena that are metalinguistic in the same sense. One example is borrowing, at an individual level where a speaker uses a word or phrase from another language before it has become fully native. The borrowed word(s) in the phrase are thus introduced via code switching, with possible changes in form and/or meaning.

The term native speaker itself is an ideological construct to the extent that it implies a single, idealized native English although there are in fact many native Englishes, some of which are valued more than others for sociopolitical reasons (Phillipson, 1992). This, in turn, has often continued to divert attention away from the development of local solutions to pedagogical problems and impeded the process of building on local strengths, resulting in the creation of ideological dependence. In the particular case of the United States, the origins of the native-speaker fallacy lay in the American movement as discussed above. The general assumption was that one must be either born or brought up from a very early age in a particular country to be considered a “native” speaker of its language, and that despite the existence of other Englishes, it is the native speaker model, based on the idea of a particular English-speaking nation that counts (Holliday, 2009).

The new thinking is that regardless of where these Englishes are located, English now belongs to everyone who uses it. This implies an element of liberation from being particularly associated with a language standard by virtue of place of birth. Someone who comes upon English for the first time has as much right to it as someone who has grown up using it. This cosmopolitan view also affects the way we look at the

boundaries of English (*see, e.g.*, Saraceni, 2008; Canagarajah, 2006). This resonates with Maley's (2006) observation about the way in which English is often used in international settings where people are "sublimely unaware of concepts like 'Standard English'" and "are simply engaged in the imperfect, unruly, untidy business of trying to make themselves understood." (p. 6)

Seidlhofer (2011) attributed a monolingual focus on native English to the presumption that "English is English is their [*i.e.*, native English speakers'] English" (p. 64) and *the* English that suits all contexts of English use and all purposes. As Hall (2014) makes explicit, "Standard English is not the language itself" and language testing must move beyond a focus on linguistic criteria in order to adequately address the "effectiveness of resources" that learners draw on when using English (pp. 376-377). In such a manner, multilingual perspectives must remain appreciated in English language education with regard to the various contexts and circumstances of use (*e.g.*, Galloway & Rose, 2014; Jenkins, 2015; Wang, 2013).

Researchers of English as a lingua franca challenge the notion that native English, which is used in monolingual native English contexts, is the golden rule for intercultural communication, which often takes place in multilingual contexts (*see, e.g.*, Jenkins, 2014; Seidlhofer, 2011). Multilingualism challenges our picture of language rather substantially. If language is a relation between signifiers and signified, what is then *two* languages? It must be two such relations, for sure. But how do we distinguish them? How do we know which is which? How can and should the language faculty deal with these two languages? And if people can speak several languages, which ones are they using at a given moment? How do the interlocutors find out which one they are hearing? And how

do they understand them? (Kracht, 2014) These are questions which must be addressed for advanced EFL students, so as not to allow a gap to grow between advanced classroom English and English in students' sociolinguistic reality outside of the classroom.

Summary

The "English Only" approach to the teaching of English as a foreign language has by no means always been the norm, but rather gained predominance over the course of the 20th century based on the L2 language use in communicative situations without recourse to the use of the native language. However, insistence on the L2 only has not realistically meant that the L1 is not used in practice. This is most commonly evidenced through code switching.

With increased globalization, however, code switching has gained status not only as an educational tool but also as the most readily available communicative form available in the increasing number of multilingual societies. Thus, code switching is readily available as a practical matter for classrooms engaged in the second language teaching and learning process.

While it cannot be gainsaid that L2 exposure leads to L2 proficiency, it is not the only tool available to navigate the path of L2 language learning. One must recognize that an L2 learner will always retain the L1 present in their minds and every activity the students carry out visibly in the L2 will also involve the invisible L1. Thus the majority of research now has begun to indicate beneficial results obtained with the introduction of limited L1 use, with the educational level of the students playing a most important role to determine the effectiveness of code-switching as a learning strategy.

While raising the question, this position does not in and of itself provide any answer regarding teaching methodologies, such as which L1 uses should be selected and integrated into classroom practices, which ones should continue to be banned, and on what grounds does the teacher decide which code-switching practices are permissible and which ones are not. These issues will be further examined in detail through the following chapter.

CHAPTER III
THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

Description of the Project

The purpose of this project is to examine what the current status of research indicates about the use of L1 code switching in the context of L2 instruction including, in particular, the instruction of English as a foreign or second language. This project contains three parts reviewing: (1) each of the uses of a learners' L1 as a part of L2 instruction in order to identify (a) desirable outcomes of this L1 use in L2 instruction and (b) potential disadvantages of such L1 use; (2) a summary breakdown listing the uses for teacher and student; and (3) exemplary material.

Part one reviews the broad range of uses of code switching in the context of beginning and intermediate levels of instruction, examining each potential use in some detail as to which benefits are achievable by the teacher and as to which benefits can be obtained by the student through the use of a student's L1 during L2 instruction, as well as noting any need for caution in utilizing the L1 in the L2 classroom noting the potential for undesirable outcomes of overuse. Part two lists the benefits. Part three provides a short dialogue or similar interaction and notes the relation of the example to the issues raised within the discussion of part one.

Development of the Project

I have chosen this particular review as to the status of L1 use in teaching English as a foreign or second language, as to uses for both the beginning/intermediate level as well as the advanced level, based upon my own language studies as a native English speaker, experience with practice of non-English second languages, and world travels in our current age of globalization.

In my experiences over the last half-century, non-English language usage has not always been favored as a means of communication within the United States. One need not go back to many decades from today in order to observe extreme political and social disfavor regarding the use of languages other than English in the educational environment – even where the students themselves were L1 speakers of other languages. As only one example, this concept certainly reached an apex in the restrictions placed on K-12 instruction in non-English languages which regained force over the 1990s.

Yet further discussion concerning the merits of such an approach became itself obsolete within the short timeframe of another decade, when the growth of the internet between 2000 to 2010 established globalization as the bedrock for a new social norm. Not only did communications advancements foster increased access, exposure and acceptance of additional languages in an increasingly multilingual world, but it was English itself in particular that that increasingly gained the status of lingua franca.

The dichotomy engendered by this development is seen, for example, in the fact that any mass transit ride in San Francisco contains announcements in English, Spanish, Cantonese Chinese and Tagalog, while English is a suitable lingua franca for use in accomplishing any mass transit ride in Mexico City, Guangzhou and Manila.

In order to develop this project, the results of the past two decades of analysis regarding L1 use as a part of L2 instruction have been reviewed, codified with regard to instruction purpose(s) and elaborated upon for further incorporation into L2 lesson planning and performance.

These include the effects which L1 use may have at the successive levels of L2 instruction. This analysis reviews the results of the past decade of research projects regarding both the efficacies and downsides of classroom L1 use, particularly with regard to L1 use in the context of teaching English as a foreign language in non-English speaking environments. This review details the uses of code switching as a practical guide for the purposes of beginning and intermediate learners in English language instruction, providing a functional manual to employ code switching in teaching English as a second or foreign language. The methodology used to develop this project was a systematic literature review. Per Eriksson, Barajas, Forsberg & Wengström (2013), this researcher first systematically searched for relevant literature on the above issues of L1 use and code switching in order to critically examine and compile this found literature within the field. In this respect, the systematic literature review summarizes the previous research that already exists about a phenomenon. The intent of this review is to give rise to new research needs and/or produce educational knowledge to further compel multilingual classroom uses as a part of second language instruction.

**CODE SWITCHING:
A GUIDEBOOK**

CONTENTS**Introduction****Code Switch Topics:**

Addressee Specification	Explanation Of Meanings, Concepts And Ideas
Advice	Floor Holding/Gap Filling
Affiliation And Membership	Grammar Presentation
Alignment And Misalignment	Group Membership
Ambiguity, Elimination Of	Humor
Appropriateness Of Context	Ideological Statement
Assessment Of Comprehension	Instructions Or Prompts
Attracting Attention	Interjections
Avoidance Strategy	Meta-Language
Bilingual Dictionaries	Morphology
Classroom Management	Need Assessment
Comprehension Assessment	Personalization And Objectivization
Conflict Control	Pronunciation
Confusion Avoidance	Quotation
Cross-Cultural Issues	Reiteration/Repetition
Discipline	Repair Strategy
Dual Language Texts	Security And Confidence
Emotional Expression	Topic Shift
Equivalence	Translation
Exclusion Of Other People	Vocabulary
Explanation Of Errors	

INTRODUCTION

Code Switching: A Guidebook provides a reference resource for instructors of English as a Foreign Language as to the many and varied uses of code switching in the classroom as part of the English teaching process. Significant research has been conducted over the last two decades into the value which can be obtained from judicious uses of the English learners' first language as a part of the teaching of English as a target second language. *Code Switching: A Guidebook* is in the form of a concise, functional manual. Subject areas outlining these uses are arranged alphabetically. Each entry contains a brief summary discussion distilled from the observations obtained by studies into first language use as a part of the second language teaching process. As appropriate for specific items, the entries also contain a brief point summarization with respect to the teacher and the student and an illustrative example is provided as applicable to the specific entry; several entries contain a generalized overview of much broader function areas. The scope of *Code Switching: A Guidebook* is primarily intended towards teachers of English as a target second language to students at the beginning to intermediate level of instruction.

The design of *Code Switching: A Guidebook* is intended to fill a gap between the academic research results and classroom reference resources for the purpose of practicable review and incorporation in the classroom teaching structure. First language use as a part of teaching English as a target second language can not only assist learners with regard to specific issues of the language instruction and learning agenda but also can help to create a space for learners and the teacher to provide each other and themselves with a source of support and assistance in that English language learning process.

ADDRESSEE SPECIFICATION

Code switching is used in addressee specification, whereby a speaker employs code switching in order to direct the message to one of several possible addressees. By specifying an addressee through code switching, the speaker directs speech to one specific addressee in a group of speakers present in the immediate environment.

However, addressee specification can also be used to exclude someone by code switching to a language no one else in the group understands apart from the speaker and that addressee.

Addressee specification can be used with monolinguals, so as to accommodate monolingual speakers by switching to the language they know, and with bilinguals where the addressee is invited to participate in the conversation.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Message direction to one out of several possible addressees for purposes of inclusion within the group • Message direction to one out of several possible addressees for purposes of exclusion of the remainder of the group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Message direction to one out of several possible addressees for purposes of inclusion within the group • Message direction to one out of several possible addressees for purposes of exclusion of the remainder of the group

Example

When the teacher finds out that a student is from Buenos Aires, the teacher uses the opportunity to greet the student with “*vos sos*”, which is the distinctive Argentinian familiar form for “you are” (as compared to Castilian Spanish “*tu eres*”).

TR: Welcome to the class. *Vos sos bien?* [How are you?]

ADVICE

Code switching from L2 to L1 may be used by the teacher in order to advise the learners, which may be seen as an especially useful practice for beginner groups. For example, when a teacher ascertains that the learners are having difficulties in understanding the conversations listened to in class, the teacher may switch codes from the L2 under instruction back to students' L1 in order to clearly advise them as to what they need to do in order to improve their L2 skills. By switching the code to L1 to give advice, the teacher can be more certain that the learners have understood the advice.

Teacher

- To clearly advise the students as to what they can and should be doing in order to improve L2 proficiency

Example

Following the teacher providing a definition of the expression “mountain climbing” which the student had not understood, the teacher continues by providing advice to the students that they must listen to the lesson instruction tapes while at home to improve their listening skills.

ST: *O que ... que es* [Oh, what is ... what is] mountain climbing?

TR: Mountain climbing *es subir a montaña. Escuchen la lección en casa, y ayudará mejorar sus habilidades* [is climbing a mountain. Listen to the lesson at home, it will help your skills], okay?

AFFILIATION AND MEMBERSHIP

Speakers may code switch when they want to establish a relationship between themselves and/or membership within a pertinent group. In addition to language choice, an extensive range of number of other socio-cultural factors may provide a foundation for this function of code switching. These include factors such (a) situation, domain, setting; (b) role relationships, status, authority, hierarchy; (c) attitude, intention and effect; (d) personal values, emotions.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To establish a relationship between themselves • To establish mutual membership within a pertinent group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To establish a relationship between themselves • To establish mutual membership within a pertinent group

Example

The following excerpt illustrates the teacher's effort in enacting a relationship with the students through code switching.

TR: All agreed? What about *nuestro amigo* [our friend] over there?

Even though the teacher could use the L2 word for "friend," use of the L1 Spanish word is a strategy to show that although a superior, the classroom participants are all seen as friends.

ALIGNMENT AND DISALIGNMENT

One feature of conversation is the adoption of temporary social roles. Given that conversation is a negotiated enterprise, the teacher and students sustain a particular role. In the language classroom code switches constitute a strategy for this kind of negotiation. There may be occasion in the classroom for the need to adopt different roles as the conversation exercise proceeds, for example, in a particular speech event one might assume the roles, successively, of superior, colleague, and friend. What may also occur are overt attempts to change both the roles of and the type of talk taking place. As these themes unfold through a particular stretch of discourse, they mark the conversational territory and the roles, rights, and obligations of the participants within it. However, a concern about L1 mother tongue use in the language classroom is that it is used to disalign or shift the focus of talk away from the pedagogical concerns of the classroom.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To establish, adapt and/or change role • To establish, adapt and/or change the topic of conversation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To establish, adapt and/or change role • To establish, adapt and/or change the topic of conversation

Example

ST1: I talk Spanish because I don't know some of the meanings of words.

ST2: What did you do yesterday?

ST1: *Nada mucho* [not much].

ST2: Why are you ... ?

ST1 breached the convention that language learners practice L2 English in the language classroom. The ST2 switch back to L2 English is an overt attempt to realign the group back to the initial footing of L2 English to convey that L1 discussion is inappropriate.

AMBIGUITY, ELIMINATION OF

Real functions are mostly unplanned, serving true communication needs. The teacher and students may desire less ambiguity and, for example, use the L1 in making quite spontaneous comments, or when students chat with their peers. In addition, the teacher may use the L1 as a warm up tool and facilitator in order to overcome ambiguity. This provides students with a more comfortable learning atmosphere by removing the affective filter of anxiety, and increases student motivation to be more actively involved in the learning process with a feeling of familiarity. Naturalness in the management of different languages in class may have the intended result that students associate the L2 with genuine communication and thus incorporate it in a genuine way in the classrooms.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warm-up tool • Introduction of another idea • Student direction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer conversation

Example

At the lesson start, the students are prepared to turn in completed homework to the students.

TR: I see that everyone has brought their completed homework. *Aquí es un buena idea para empezar...* [Here's a good idea to start ...] Exchange your homework with the student next to you

APPROPRIATENESS OF CONTEXT

Appropriateness of context concerns the use of utterances in order to gain an understanding of the meanings of an L2 form that has been used by someone else. This is usually achieved through (1) translation of the utterance into the L1, or through a (2) definition, (3) synonym, or (4) paraphrase of the utterance under consideration in the L2 conversation.

Student

- To better understand meaning(s) of an L2 form within the conversation

Example

The students are improvising a written travel dialogue exchange.

ST1: Are we stopping at the hotel to get our luggage at the front desk.

ST2: What's front desk?

ST1: *Mostrador* [front desk]. We'll stop at the front desk, go to the room, unpack...

ST2: Okay ... Yes, first we are stopping at the hotel to get our luggage at the front desk.

The focus of this example is ST2's process of understanding the meaning of the L2 words "front desk." ST2 requests help, which ST1 provides by translating the word into L1. ST1 then continues working on the composition while ST2 makes sense of the sentence.

ASSESSMENT OF COMPREHENSION

The L1 may be utilized by the teacher not only to enhance students' comprehension, but also to see whether they have understood a point which had just been made. L1, as the most reliable source that teacher and students have in common, helps them compensate for communication breakdowns and overcome comprehension problems. Through teacher-induced code switching, the teacher may ask a student to translate into L1 what had just been said in English. This provides the teacher a means to assess a student's understanding of the learning material without further time spent. Additional indications might include facial gestures showing lack of comprehension or silence in response to teachers' comprehension check questions.

Teacher

- To check and enhance comprehension level
- To overcome communication problem or break

Example

The teacher is reviewing with the students a homework reading lesson about American history.

ST: George Washington was the first president of the United States, and Barack Obama is the current president. Manuel, can you translate that into Spanish?

ATTRACTING ATTENTION

English Only class can make the class lifeless and students then tend to get bored with it. To keep away monotony in the class, teachers may use L1 carefully so as to enliven the class, make it more enjoyable, and hold students' attention. Teachers may code switch to attract student attention and involve students in the discussion so as to help to facilitate the learning process, check if the subject has been comprehended, and provide a relaxing learning atmosphere.

The L1 serves as a psychological tool and, indeed, when teachers code switch the students may consider what the teacher is saying as more important and therefore pay even more attention.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To attract the attention of the students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To attract the attention of only the teacher or everybody in class • To hold the attention on oneself

Example

Because it was quite noisy outside the classroom at the time, the teacher used Spanish to hold the students' attention to allow them to continue to follow. By doing so, the teacher gets the learners' attention.

TR: *Vale, que pasa aqui* [So then, what is that here], what is that here?

AVOIDANCE STRATEGY

Code switching may occur as part of an avoidance strategy, which is a subtype of production strategy in communicating. These switches occur when a learner appears to have the linguistic resources to convey the message in L2, but instead chooses to do so by inserting an L1 word or expression into the utterance. The motivation for the language switch may be either linguistic, such as an attempt to avoid a difficult target language form or one that has not yet been learned, or social, such as a desire to fit in with ones peers whereby the switch serves a socializing function. While the resulting utterance may be loosely related to the task, it more commonly represents divergence from the lesson focus.

Student

- To avoid difficult L2 form
- To cover unknown L2 form
- Peer socialization

Example

The students are in dialogue about what they do during weekends.

ST1: Okay, so what do you think about that?

ST2: Er, that is good idea. *Hay muchos lugares para caminar*. [There are many places to walk.]

ST1: Yes. Do you do any exercise?

ST2: *¡Nada!* [Nothing!] I do nothing.

BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

Students who see code switching as an obstacle for L2 learning may think that learners can become used to resorting to the L1 for unknown words or words they do not know how to pronounce in the L2 instead of making an effort to paraphrase, look for synonyms, or consult a dictionary for the right pronunciation. In other words, they say that code switching can propitiate linguistic laziness.

However, when code switching occurs unintentionally or unconsciously, it helps the learner to find out that there are words or expressions which they may have been ignoring in the L2 target language. Thus, the responsible and active learner will look that word up and increase vocabulary. While there are also many monolingual dictionaries around these days, many learners have been using bilingual ones, of varying quality. An approach which explicitly considers and incorporates these is a more effective way of drawing out and dealing with their use. The students' L1 use with bilingual dictionary may make teaching more efficient, inasmuch as students may more readily learn words needed to express themselves.

Student

- Pinpoint unknown or missed word meanings in the L2
- Track ranges of meaning between respective L2 and L1 words

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

The class may use the L1 as the means in order to perform the classroom's framework interactions, to deal with vital information for classroom management apart from the instruction of the L2 per se, such as instructions necessary for activities, class assessment requirements, record keeping, reports, student records, registers and so forth. The teacher may also use the L1 to provide a wrap up of the day's lesson at the end of class, or to summarily review a previous lesson scope at the start of class.

Teacher

- To perform framework interactions
- To provide and/or receive vital information
- To make required class assessments and record keeping
- Class activity wrap-ups

Example

The teacher is passing out a school form for each student to take home for the parents to complete for a school outing event.

TR: So please take this home and *dile a tus padres que lo lean y lo firmen* [have your parents review and sign it]. Bring it back by next Monday, after the weekend.]

The teacher is finishing the day's class with a wrap-up.

TR: ... And the one page writing assignment on what you are planning to do this weekend is due at the end of the week, on Friday. *Al fin de semana, el viernes* [at the end of the week, on Friday].

COMPREHENSION ASSESSMENT

The teacher can achieve far more subtlety and precision when using both L1 and L2 to convey and check meanings of nuances than by using only L2. Teachers may ask students to translate into L1 what they had just said in the L2 while maintaining the essence of the meaning. In this way, the teacher can confirm that the students had understood the learning material and, therefore, no further elaboration was needed. This is especially useful and appropriate when the teacher observes one or more of various signs indicating the students' difficulty in understanding some explanation given by the teacher, such as student questions, facial gestures showing their lack of comprehension, or silence in response to teachers' comprehension check questions.

The difference between a confirmation of students' better comprehension and a comprehension check is that for the former, the teacher provides a discretionary explanation without the apparent presence of any symptom of lack of student comprehension, whereas the latter is the outcome of the teacher observing some signs of lack of comprehension.

Teacher

- To confirm understanding without elaboration and additional time
- To investigate observed secondary signs of comprehension difficulty

CONFLICT CONTROL

Code switching may serve as a means of conflict control so as to prevent or avoid misunderstandings between students. Students use this function where there are no culturally equivalent words or phrases between the L1 mother tongue and L2 target language which would be able to convey the intended meaning and avoid further misunderstandings. The underlying reasons for the tendency to use this type of code switching may vary according to students' needs, intentions or purposes. Where the student seeks to avoid a misunderstanding or tends to utter words indirectly for specific purposes, code switching is a strategy to transfer the intended meaning. Additionally, the lack of some culturally equivalent lexis among the native language and target language – which may lead to violation of the transference of intended meaning – may result in code switching for conflict control by avoiding possible misunderstandings.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To compensate for nonequivalence between L2 and L1 lexis base 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To avoid possible misunderstandings dependent on purposes • To compensate for nonequivalence between L2 and L1 lexis base

Example

The students are engaged in a role play dialogue where one has to tell a falsehood without the other student's specific knowledge that the first student is supposed to do that.

ST: I would say that she is a *mentirosa* [liar] to my friends, because I don't want to say "liar" because I'm not sure, not sure, of all meaning of that.

CONFUSION AVOIDANCE

The classroom environment may foster negative emotions in students such as confusion, pressure, freight, frustration, and intimidation, all inherent in having to deal with an unknown language. Use of the L1 may play a role in alleviating those negative feelings. The teacher is able to make presentation of the current classroom activity less scary, less daunting, with less pressure to understand in an unknown L2 alone and therefore less overwhelming. The teacher is thus less likely to lose students through any potentially perceived intimidation, confusion and frustration towards the unknown.

An incorrect meaning, wrongly assumed through being exposed to the L2, may be dispelled through use of the L1. Code switching helps to facilitate the flow of classroom instruction since the teachers do not have to spend so much time trying to explain to the learners or searching for the simplest words to clarify any confusion that might arise. Teachers may code switch when the L2 level used in the textbook or to be taught is beyond the learner's ability or when the teachers have exhausted the means to adjust L2 speech to the learner's level.

Teacher

- To alleviate negative feeling
- To facilitate flow of classroom information
- To avoid time spending on rudimentary matters

CROSS-CULTURAL ISSUES

There is much, not only linguistic but also lying deeper than mere surface meanings, that can be surfaced through comparison and contrast and the judicious use of the mother tongue, such as connotation, collocation, idiomatic usages, culture-specific lexis, politeness formulae, sociocultural norms, the use of intonation, gestures, etc. Mother tongue interference becomes helpful with code switching use to explain unfamiliar, difficult and new words, terms or expressions.

The advantages might involve cultural aspects, as well. That is to say, cultural similarities and differences may be highlighted to help learners accept differences while preserve their cultural identity, which could be done through many activities including the use of L1. Some cultural events or cultural vocabulary cannot be translated, or at least are often not translated in a conversation otherwise entirely in L2 because it does not give the same feeling as one has in the native L1.

Code switching is thus generated by a number of socio-cultural factors in order to exhibit or express role relationships, topics, intention and effect, attitude, values and beliefs, personal emotions, situation, domain, setting and language choice. A comparison of L2 and the L1 becomes a classroom opportunity for similarities and differences of both languages to be discovered and target language learning enhanced.

DISCIPLINE

Teacher's use of L1 in order to manage discipline in the classroom is an affective basis for code switching. The teacher's code choice serves as a specific discourse in the classroom, with the teacher's words in the L1 having much more power and authority than if the L2 solely were used instead.

Code switching may be required to handle serious, unexpected and sudden events – for example, if a fight or some other serious problem breaks out, it would be more detrimental to delay communication should the teacher continue using the L2 to effectively handle and dealing with it. Secondly, as the student's native language, use of the L1 will have more immediate emotive resonance with the student, such as reprimanding a late comer. Lastly, factors such as class size and organization may influence the choice of code switching. For example, a teacher may more easily engage a class if its size is small, but it may become more difficult to manipulate a larger class depending on the student group make-up.

Teacher

- To use specific means of fully comprehensible discourse for clarity
- To obtain more immediate emotional resonance

Example

As a student enters into late (and is frequently late), the teacher reiterates the class time.

TR: Good morning, Sofia. We've already discussed in the past, *esta clase empieza a las seis en punto* [this class starts at 6 sharp].

DUAL LANGUAGE TEXTS

Comparing and contrasting translations of poems, short stories, passages, etc. (also work with videos/DVDs with L1 subtitles) can shed light on all sorts of areas of both comprehension and production. In the classroom and outside, numerous possibilities exist for students to use the LI in learning, particularly as a way into the meanings of L2 words. One is the use of dual language texts on facing pages, another the use of L2 films with LI subtitles (sometimes found as an option in video techniques), and a third the use of bilingual dictionaries. The student's creation of bilingual written material and the sharing of this work reinforces a student's sense of self and fuels sustained engagement with literacy. Indeed, adult students who explore ideas initially in the L1 and wrote first in that language may continue on to write L2 pieces considerably more developed than their usual second language writing. Students invest their identities in the creation of these texts which can be written, spoken, visual, musical, dramatic, or combinations in multimodal form. The identity text then holds a mirror up to students in which their identities are reflected back in a positive light.

Furthermore, when students share identity texts with multiple audiences, such as peers, teachers, parents, media, etc., they are likely to receive positive feedback and affirmation of self in interaction with these audiences. Although not always an essential component, technology acts as an amplifier to enhance the process of identity investment and affirmation. It facilitates the production of these texts, makes them look more accomplished, and expands the audiences and potential for affirmative feedback.

EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION

Affective functions are used for expression of emotions. In a rationale and stable state of mind, a person is able to think of the right vocabulary to be used in the target language; code switching is triggered when the speaker is emotionally affected, including upset, excited, tired, happy, surprised, scared or distracted. For example, this function is one used when the teacher is disappointed with the students and uses the mother tongue to express anger or frustration. This is not always a conscious process on the part of the teacher; the mood of the speaker determines the kind of languages to be used.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To express affective functions concerning emotional state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To express affective functions concerning emotional state

Example

The teacher deal with the issue of a students feigned ignorance in not completing homework.

TR: Why didn't you write these exercises? You should write all the exercise

ST: I didn't know we should write all of them.

TR: *Siempre hemos hecho todos ejercicios* [We always write all the exercises].

EQUIVALENCE

Because of the lack of proficiency in the L2 target language, students switch code and make use of L1 mother tongue for the equivalent of a certain lexical item. The equivalence function provides students an opportunity to fill in the gaps resulting from the linguistic incompetence and gives the student the opportunity to continue communication by filling the gaps resulting from target language deficiency in the target language. This process may be correlated with a deficiency in linguistic competence of target language, which makes the student use the native lexical item when the student does not have the competence for using the target language explanation for a particular lexical item. Equivalence functions as a defensive mechanism for students as it gives the student the opportunity to continue communication by bridging the gaps resulting from foreign language incompetence.

Using the students' L1 as a bilingual dictionary, teaching may be made more efficient, and students can more easily learn the words they needed to express themselves. Therefore, teachers should consider students' native language a natural shortcut to learning that should be utilized where appropriate, instead of avoiding code switching in class entirely.

Furthermore, using an L1 equivalent is not only quicker and less ambiguous than attempting to paraphrase in L2, but is essential for the contrastive analysis that occurs, where learners examine the difference in connotations between semantically similar L2 lexical items for which there is a single L1 equivalent.

Student

- To compensate when participants don't know English meaning
- To continue discourse in a rapid manner
- To avoid ambiguity

Example

Two students discuss morning activities.

ST1: How was your morning? Er I went to, er how do you say *matricularse* [enroll]?

ST2: Um...I'm not sure.

B: *Fui a matricularme en la Alianza Francesa.* [I went to enroll at the French Alliance.]

Several students discuss geography.

ST1: So how do you say *frontera*? [border/boundary/frontier]

ST2: Er...

ST1: It's like a border, or a boundary. I thought *frontera* was frontier?

ST2: Yes, I think frontier and boundary are the same.

EXCLUSION OF OTHER PEOPLE

Switching languages allows speakers to address specific interlocutors in a group and to exclude others, perhaps by choosing the dominant language of the person being addressed, so as to control the addressees in a conversation or to exclude them from interaction. Manipulating a conversation in such manner may happen only when a communicative exchange involves more than two participants, including at least one monolingual addressee.

Directive switching serves to include or exclude specific conversational participants by using either a speaker's preferred or dispreferred language choice, for example in some cases where students may believe that their language is not considered to be prestigious. Such participant-related switching, can be convergent, when speakers use their interlocutors' preferred language, or divergent, which may create distance between speaker and hearer because of dispreferred choices. Expressive code switching may serve mainly to express the multilingual status of the speaker, whereby each individual switch does not necessarily carry specific meaning, but the overall pattern of language use does.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To manipulating conversation in presence of more than two people to include or exclude others • To exhibit socio-cultural factors concerning language use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To manipulating conversation in presence of more than two people to include or exclude others • To exhibit socio-cultural factors concerning language use

EXPLANATION OF ERRORS

Code switching serves the speaker in order to modify language for personal intentions, which may accordingly facilitate second language acquisition by means of a transfer from L1 to L2. However, L1 transfer may also lead to errors in L2 language use. When errors are caused by L1 transfer, the teacher may go back to the L1 through code switching and then consider what went wrong and why in order to explain and correct the student error in L2 usage. Since the English Only classroom cannot always ensure comprehensible input, code switching fulfills the communicative aspects of the syllabus and teaching approach.

Teacher

- To reference L1 to ascertain, explain and correct errors

Example

The students are discussing traditional American Christmas customs following a reading assignment from their textbook.

ST: And before going to bed, they must be sure to turn off the fire so that Santa Claus can arrive down the chimney during the night.

TR: Yes, but in English we do not say “turn off the fire” – *en español se dice “apagar” el fuego* [in Spanish one says “turn off” the fire] – in English we say “put out” the fire.

EXPLANATION OF MEANINGS, CONCEPTS AND IDEAS

The teacher can achieve far more subtlety and precision when using both L1 and L2 to check on nuances than only L2. Teachers may switch code when the L2 level of the text-book or course material is beyond the student's ability. Code switching is used to explain new terms or words and difficult grammatical items, with L1 mother tongue interference becoming helpful to achieve precision.

Teacher

- To achieve subtly and precision on points course materials exceed student ability

Example

When the class is going through a new lesson, there are new words and expressions in English that the teacher wanted the students to understand.

TR: Yes. Here the meaning of average is different from the other, previous example, *mediano* [average] when it meant "ordinary." Here, the average of 3, 7 and 8 is 6. In this sentence, average means *promedio* [numerical average].

FLOOR HOLDING/GAP FILLING

The floor holding/gap filling function is used by the student during a conversation in the L2 as a means of filling a stopgap in production. This code switching function is used by learners wishing to continue without pausing or being interrupted, and so a switch from L2 to L1 occurs because the item can be retrieved more quickly in L1. Students who do not know or who cannot recall the appropriate language structure or vocabulary for the L2 target language use floor holding to help to continue the conversation without gaps. During the conversation in the target language, the students fill the stopgap with native language use.

While this is a mechanism used by the students in order to avoid gaps in communication, which may result from the lack of fluency in the target language, it may be claimed that this type of language alternation may have negative effects on learning a foreign language, since it may result in loss of fluency in long term.

Student

- To quickly fill stopgap production without pause or interruption

Example

ST: If I were a famous person, I'd be an actor, a, errh, oh, *estrella* [movie star] ... star. I like to be in a movie with, errh, superhéroes [superheroe], Superman.

ST: My hometown is in the, aaah, not, not in city, far from city in the, aaah, where there is *playa* [beach] and ocean.

GRAMMAR PRESENTATION

There are aspects of English grammar and phonology that will be totally alien to certain groups of learners (e.g., articles; verb tense forms; shifting stress accent) and an introduction in the student's L1, involving a comparison with that L1, can be invaluable for clarifying what these are and how they work. Indeed, meta-language is frequently a lot more complex than what it is being used to describe and L1 can smooth the path so as to avoid unnecessary terminology in L2 at introductory stages. A bridge from known (L1) to unknown (L2) is constructed in order to transfer the new content and meaning. In this fashion, the students can ask about grammatical rules and structures with vocabulary already within their knowledge, and the teacher can explain and clarify those structures in a manner accessible to the students while moving forward with the lesson.

Teacher

- To bridge for transfer of new rules
- To compare similarities/differences between L2 and L1
- To clarify structures

Example

TR: This first exercise has to do with prepositions "by" and "with". OK, when you are using the passive verb, which preposition do you use the most? "By" or "with"?

ST: "With"?

TR: No, "by". Why? Because you use it to say something is done by something else. He was hit by a car. *Comperado al español, fue atropellado por un carro* [Compare it to Spanish, he was hit by a car].

GROUP MEMBERSHIP

The student's L1 native language may be the best way to make interpersonal connections. Thus, code switching in foreign language classes can establish the teacher's desire to relate to students on a more personal level rather than as one who is there simply to convey information.

Code switching to L1 in the classroom creates a sense of solidarity and sameness, creating the sense of a bilingual situation for the teacher and students. This strongly signals group membership, not only with respect to language learning but strongly associated with political, cultural, ethnic and other identity shared by the classroom, notwithstanding the classroom's focus on 2L language instruction. In multilingual communities that include social minorities, the language of the minority is often considered the code that indexes in-group membership (also called the "we-code"), while the language of the dominant group indexes power and formality, often because of its association with official political authority (also called the "they-code"). The learners' L1 serves as a marker of in-group membership and solidarity that parallels this notion of in-group membership and solidarity.

However, the detraction in identifying emphasizes the undesirability of making a priori assumptions about how speakers feel about specific languages and of assuming a one-to-one mapping of code choice and speaker identity.

HUMOR

Inclusion of the L1 native language in the teaching process provides students with a more comfortable learning atmosphere, reducing the affective filter by removing anxiety which would otherwise hinder interaction in language learning process. Code switching thus assists the teacher to maintain a social relationship with learners.

Teachers may use humor in the classroom to help learners to create a comfortable atmosphere, allowing students to create bonds among classmates, express their solidarity and build a sense of team spirit, and to thus raise interest and to make learning more enjoyable in the classroom. The teacher may code switch to make a joke more understandable. Code switching to the students' L1 may serve as a warm-up tool as well as a facilitator to overcome ambiguity, for example, with regard to the lesson plan. Code switching may also serve poetic functions in the language learning process, as student speakers switch languages in order to effectively make puns, tell jokes and engage in longer projects such as producing poetry in the multiple L1 and L2 languages.

Since a feeling of familiarity in the classroom setting provided by code switching relieves boredom and increases motivation, the students are more actively involved in learning.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of humor: to make jokes, wordplays, for exact expression of what you want to say without losing its taste, meaning, and wisdom in it.) (applies for both 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sense of humor: to make jokes, wordplays, for exact expression of what you want to say without losing its taste, meaning, and wisdom in it.) (applies for both

IDEOLOGICAL STATEMENT

When an L2 student's L1 mother tongue is kept absent from the learning environment classroom setting, the student may begin to feel uncomfortable, tensed and lost. The student may feel the need to express ideas and thoughts in his or her own language. Student learning outcome of the students is significantly related to personality factors, with student psychology forming one part of the personality factors.

With regard to ideological statements, some connotation or cultural point may need to be expressed or otherwise explained to the students in the L1. Cultural events or cultural vocabulary can at times be unable to be effectively translated – any translation does not give the same feeling to the student with respect to the topic for further discussion as there would when using the L1 native language. First language usage is inherently more emotional and certainly more accessible in imposing its own classification upon human emotional experiences.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To discuss items of specific cultural events and vocabulary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To discuss items of specific cultural events and vocabulary

Example

The students are telling what they are going to do over the weekend.

ST: And on Sunday we are going to a restaurant to celebrate the fifth of May.

TR: Okay, how fun, but in English we always say “Cinco de Mayo” because it is Mexico’s holiday.

INSTRUCTIONS OR PROMPTS

The teacher may make use of code switching in giving instructions to the learners (as well as when receiving instructions). Code switching to the students' L1 enables the teacher to give task instructions more effectively. Indeed, this serves to highlight the importance of understanding the teacher's instructions for classroom activities as well as homework. Especially at early levels, this will ensure that everyone fully understands what to do in the quickest and safest manner. Both time efficiency and learner confidence can be greatly assisted by the use of the L1, with the L2 being introduced gradually and built up.

Teacher

- To ensure full understanding
- To highlight the importance of understanding the teacher's instructions

Example

The teacher gives the students an exercise using the passive voice. They were to use the active voice to prepare signs to hang up from rules which were written in the passive voice. During her explanation of the task in English, students had questions.

ST: Are we supposed to write this in active?

TR: And then write a couple of signs, two or so

ST: A sign?

TR: Sign. *Letrero – unos letreros* [sign – a couple of signs]. Make your own signs.

INTERJECTIONS

When functioning as interjections or sentence filler, code switching is used for better expression, clarification or better understanding. This type can be described as automatic, mechanical, or unintended. Increased volume of the words often is also typically evident with respect to the L1 language switch, providing additional indication that the L1 utterance was an interjection and not a calm, controlled correction.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To express automatic, mechanical and/or unintended emotional responses • To better express or clarify for understanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To express automatic, mechanical and/or unintended emotional responses • To fill gaps in expressing statement

Example

The teacher was explaining to the students a common situation faced by a presenter during a presentation – a presenter would be surprised if asked questions that the presenter could not answer.

TR: And if I am asked a question and I cannot think of the answer, and I think, ¡*Díos mio!* [my goodness!], and then I remember ...

The teacher inserted the phrase ¡*Díos mio!* to express the negative feeling if she was in the situation.

META-LANGUAGE

Metalinguistic code switches occur when speakers wish to comment on their own language use either directly or indirectly, and the use of L1 as a contrasting linguistic code makes the comments more salient. They mark a break in the flow of conversation, and a change of focus such as from content to form. While learners perform classroom learning tasks in the L2, discussion about the tasks and other procedural concerns may often be articulated in L1. Similarly, when clarifying metalinguistic work of giving a definition is undertaken, the definition researched and provided by the student may have a double effect on in L2 learning, with both brushing up of definition skills and the intake of new data provided.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To comment on own language use • To contrast between L2 and L1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To discuss procedural concerns to perform

Example

A student walks in late to class and the teacher has started instruction.

TR: Okay, we'll do the last question, where were you born?

ST1: In Monterrey.

ST2: (arriving) Oh, Ms. Jones. *Ay, no comprendí --pensé que íbamos a estar en otra aula.* [Oh, I misunderstood – I thought we'd be in another room.]

T: Okay, don't worry, come in and sit down.

MORPHOLOGY

A benefit in the use of code switching to the student's L1 is the assistance provided for the student's understanding of morphological issues. While there is a popular belief is that one uses form and grammar to understand meaning, the truth is probably closer to the opposite: we acquire morphology and syntax because we understand the meaning of utterances. Furthermore, comparison through contrastive presentations involving the use of code switching between the target L2 and the student's native L1 may be difficult, if not impossible, to avoid if there is no transparent relation between a native and target language structure. In addition, even when the switch occurs between two more similarly related languages, if a learner, attempting to communicate in the L2 uses a term from the L1 mother tongue but makes no attempt to adjust the morphology or phonology, the student may continue to simply employ the strategy labeled "language switch" without advancement in L2 learning and usage.

Teacher

- To discuss word features of morphology, derivation, and syntax
- To contrastively compare L2 and L1 structure

Example

The students are discussing fruits and vegetables to buy at the market.

ST: And I would buy many *jitomates* [tomatoes] to make a sauce.

TR: Good, but in English we say "tomato" not "*jitomates*" --- we got that word from Spanish but changed it a little: tomato.

NEED ASSESSMENT

The teacher may use the L1 as a tool for initial assessment purposes in order to identify student needs and goals. Very often, L1 literacy and speaking skills are not themselves differentiated in L2 determining placement in accord with L2 literacy and speaking ability through the intake assessment and placement process. The result is that students with little L1 literacy background are grouped with those who are literate in their L1 but have only beginning oral 2L proficiency. For those with little L1 literacy background and schooling, the effect is often to completely preclude participation and progress, causing a revolving door syndrome in which students start a course, fail to succeed, start again, and may eventually give up. In other words, this may replicate conditions outside the classroom with respect to language/literacy-dependent positions.

In contrast, an instructional strategy in which students are invited to reflect on their own L1 writing attitudes and practices, write a composition in the L1 for example, and then analyze their L1 writing processes, strategies, and strengths based on this composition, all provide a valuable resource for the teacher to move forward with as to L2 instruction. Furthermore, the students will likely feel freer to express themselves, letting the teacher know what they want, in addition to a baseline for the students' native language competency.

Teacher

- To identify student needs and goals in initial assessment

Example

TR: You may answer this evaluation in Spanish. This is important in order to understand where you will be starting in the curriculum based on your experiences.

PERSONALIZATION AND OBJECTIVIZATION

Code switching here functions to describe a large class of stylistic and semantic phenomena emanating from whether a statement is of the speaker's opinion, generally known facts, or refers to specific instances. The exact meaning of the switching will vary depending on the context and content of the conversation. Code switching here is concerned more with the degree of speaker's involvement in, or distance from, a message, whether a statement reflects a personal opinion or knowledge, and whether it refers to specific instances or to a generally known fact. Speakers change languages in order to express solidarity or empathy with their interlocutors, with the achievement through the means of code switching creating closeness to the students.

Speakers may code switch in order to make their message more personal or more objective. By alternating languages, speakers can express their emotional involvement with the content and their interlocutors or they can distance themselves from the subject matter and other speakers. Humor, praise and encouragement, and chastising are all classifications analogous to the personalization and objectification as well.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To establish basis for statement as to speakers opinion, generally known facts, or reference to specific instances • To convey emotional involvement in statement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To establish basis for statement as to speakers opinion, generally known facts, or reference to specific instances • To convey emotional involvement in statement

PRONUNCIATION

The teacher may code switch to L1 in order to call the students' attention to the correct pronunciation of sounds in the L2, and in order to effectively explain the means for making the needed correction in L2 articulation.

Teacher

- To explain means for making correct L2 articulation

Example

The student was talking about how interesting it would be working as a journalist. Instead of pronouncing “think” /θɪŋk/ and “thing” /θɪŋ/ she pronounced /tɪŋk/ and /tɪn/. Other learners had already pronounced /θɪŋk/ and /θɪŋ/ in other moments. Then, in order to help the learners to overcome the difficulty of pronouncing the th sound in the words think and thing, the teacher repeats the sound four times “θ + θ + θ + θ” and switches code to Spanish to explain how the /θ/ sound under analysis was produced.

QUOTATION

Code switching for the purposes of quotation is a part of metaphorical code switching, where speakers switch languages in order to evoke a different mood or change their footing with respect to other speakers. When functioning as quotation, code switching may contain either direct quotation or reported speech. A discourse marker may also be inserted for the function of introducing the quotation, although the code switch alone has a similar effect of marking the quote. Indeed, this function for the use of code switching alone is among the most frequent in non-classroom bilingual discourse.

When code switching into the L1, the speaker may indeed be quoting her- or himself, and the speaker employ the code switch in order to act out or otherwise emphasize a different situation, place, and time than the present speaking context.

Lastly, this the code switch for quotations may also serve to clearly illustrate points concerning the borrowing of words between the L1 and L2 to the students.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To convey direct quotation or reported speech 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To convey direct quotation or reported speech

Example

In English, the teacher introduced the lesson concerning a historical biography relative to the students own culture by providing background events. In English, he further lead up to and stated that he would read an excerpt by the person. He read the quotation, and then situated the quotation by paraphrasing the previous events from the story for further discussion. The quotation of the public figure in Spanish served to focus the discussion and, as importantly, to relate the figure and the quotation to the students own backgrounds.

REITERATION/REPETITION

Another function is reiteration whereby messages are reinforced, emphasized, or clarified, particularly in cases where they are perceived to have not been understood. Where the message has already been transmitted in the L2 but not understood, the messages may be repeated in the student's native language in order to convey the message aimed to be given in the L2 by the help of the L1. There may be two further underlying reasons for this specific language alternation: first, the teacher may not have transferred the meaning exactly in the target language itself; second, the student in response may think that it appropriate to code switch as well in order to indicate to the teacher that the content is clearly understood.

Thus, when a teacher does not hear (or does not understand) the learners' utterances and requests repetition, it appears to affect the confidence of the learners, who immediately reiterate their utterance in L1, in the hope that this will be better understood. In such instances, if the teacher had replied to the L1 utterance with something such as "Okay, but tell me again in English" rather than simply accepting the switch into L1, this would not only have given learners practice in the repair strategies of repetition and/or paraphrase, but—assuming that the repair was successful—may have also a more positive motivational effect on the speakers.

<p><u>Teacher</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reinforce or clarify the message
--

Example

TR: So, some ways to communicate? ST: Advertisements.

TR: What? ST: Anuncios. [Advertisements.] TR: Ah right, advertisements.

REPAIR STRATEGY

The teacher or student may code switched for the purposes of self repair. Self repair through code switching is understood to be the practices for dealing with an unintended problem in the speaking process, and of course is equally as evident in monolingual speakers. The code switch allows the listeners (students or teacher) to follow the procedure for self repair as apart from the L2 use alone. When an unintentional, incorrect word choice is uttered in the L2 delivery, the speaker may switch to the L1 in order to mark the correction, then switch back again to continue along in the L2 statement incorporating the corrected form.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To self repair unintended error in speaking process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To self repair unintended error in speaking process

Example

The teacher asked the students to read the text, each student reading a paragraph in seriatim. The third student started to read the fourth paragraph, while he should have been reading the third one. He realized his mistake once he finished the first sentence, then switched to his mother language “*Desculpe* [My mistake]” and moved to the correct paragraph

SECURITY AND CONFIDENCE

Use of the 1L may provide the student with a sense of security and confidence in order to reduce stressful feelings. For example, students may start an exercise by writing about their lives in their L1 or a mixture of their L1 and English; this text is then translated into English with the help of teachers or more advanced bilingual students. This provides a bridge for overcoming problems of vocabulary, sentence structure and language confidence. At a certain point in the learning process, the student become more willing to experiment and take risks with the 1L. Thus, starting with the L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learners' lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves while at the same time providing meaningful written material to work with.

Thus, contrary to the claim that use of the L1 will slow the transition to and impede the development of thinking in English, it may actually facilitate this process. The student is not left with the negative feeling, "I can't say this in English, but I really want to say it," and this process also invites the group to help that student express the idea in English. Since students don't start by thinking in the L2, this allowing for the exploration of ideas in the L1 supports a gradual, developmental process in which use of the L1 drops off naturally as it becomes less necessary.

TOPIC SHIFT

When introducing another idea, the motivation for code switching is that another language is more appropriate in discussing the particular subject which has just been introduced. Unlike in the other categories, the examples of this category all include a translation of the switch, a paraphrase, or an attempt at one of them.

<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Student</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of another idea 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of another idea

Example

The students are finishing their lively discussion of the day's reading and the teacher realizes that the class time is about to end.

TR: So it looks like you all enjoyed that reading for today. *¡Entonces – basta!*
 [And there – we're done!] The homework for tomorrow is ...

TRANSLATION

Although translation has been out of fashion for quite some time now it is still a skill that many language users need; exactly what kind of translation may be necessary is an issue for individual teachers to deal with, guided by the circumstances they and their learners are in. Under conditions of student engagement in substantive projects to which they are committed (e.g. writing identity texts, projects written up in two or more languages, etc.), translation from L1 to L2 and from L2 to L1 can be a powerful tool to develop language and literacy skills and increase metalinguistic awareness.

Revisiting exclusive reliance on monolingual instructional strategies in foreign language teaching programs should not be intended or aimed at encouraging a regression back to predominant use of translation nor to dilute the centrality of promoting L2 communicative interaction in both oral and written modes in L2 classrooms. Rather, any re-examination of translation as one of the basic tenets of language learning and teaching should be conducted in order to enhance communicative interaction and literacy development opened up by technological advances such as the increasingly easy access to multimedia publications and increasingly extensive cross-cultural communication.

The classic dual-language tasks of translation may be reformulated as a vehicle for more communicative exercises. For example, a student might write a favorite recipe in L1 and then decide how to explain it in the L2 to a fellow student. These activities above all see the student as an *intercultural speaker*. In sum, (1) translation can promote the acquisition of English; (2) translation can promote biliteracy development; and (3) translation can promote identities of competence for the students.

VOCABULARY

The teacher's use of the 1L for vocabulary teaching enables the teacher to (1) provide equivalent meaning(s) in L1, (2) facilitate/clarify understanding of words and expressions, (3) elicit L2 vocabulary and grammatical structures, (4) provide equivalent meaning(s) in L1 (translate vocabulary), (5) ask equivalent meaning(s) in L1 or L2, and (6) prevent the misunderstanding of the meaning of new word. New vocabulary and new constructions of course are a central role in EFL learning. In order to prevent the misunderstanding of the meaning of the new word, teachers should provide clear, simple, and brief explanations of meaning, using the learners' 1L where most effective and efficient. In this manner, appropriate use of L1 in EFL classes involves saving class time. Instead of going through a long explanations in the target language (which may have its own benefits dependent upon circumstances), the teacher may simply give a translation of a vocabulary item.

In addition, a comparison of the 2L target language and the 1L mother tongue can provide an enriching experience. In other words, when similarities and differences of both languages are discovered, the target language learning is enhanced.

The advantages might involve cultural aspects, as well. That is to say, cultural similarities and differences may be highlighted to help learners accept differences while preserve their cultural identity, which could be done through many activities including the use of L1.

CHAPTER IV CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

This project researched and reviewed the uses of code switching by teachers as a part of classroom interaction when teaching English as a foreign or second language. This study examined a range of research results from around the globe regarding the efficacies of code switching use in the EFL/ESL teaching process (*e.g.* Brasil; China; Croatia; Cyprus; Finland; France; Germany; Iran; Japan; Lebanon; Pakistan; Sweden; Malaysia; Turkey; United Kingdom; USA). These combined research reports developed a framework of overlapping categories which analyzed and described the various applications of code switching in the EFL education process. These studies of course were conducted in a broad (and at times disparate) range of styles, for example through classroom observations, interviews, questionnaires, examinations, and so forth. These studies examined the issue from an equally broad and disparate range of differing perspectives, including the instructors' viewpoints, the students' viewpoints, as well as all varieties of students' age groups, educational settings, learning purposes, etc.

As to time frame, however, all of these studies were conducted and reported only within the last two decades. That is because for the past century instructors of English as a foreign or second language relied on the principle of English Only in the classroom setting. The English Only principal disallowed *any* use of the English learner's first language for any purposes in classroom EFL teaching. On that issue of EFL teaching, the door had remained firmly shut for over a hundred years: the L2 was seen as positive; the L1 as negative. And as a result of being effectively forbidden, it was ignored – one might

say is an even worse pedagogical fate. The avoidance of the L1 was so obvious, that no classroom use of the L1 was mentioned or examined.

However, looking beyond the classroom learning process and out into the use of language in the real world around the globe, code switching was indeed a normal practice among bilingual and multilingual speakers. Starting two decades ago, cracks appeared in the proscription against 1L use in the 2L teaching process. Thus, from the 1900s forward, there arose an increasingly positive change towards recognition and productive analysis of L1 use in 2L instruction, giving rise to the above mentioned broad range of research which was examined as the basis for this project's preparation. This research has shown that L1 code switching allows learners to retain focus on the broader goals of a learning task while concomitantly working out ways to address a specific learning issue as well as social issues in the classroom. In a relaxed, yet fully focused manner, learners may more readily participate in classroom practice and activities with greater resultant advancement in learning the English language. Furthermore, a multilingual teaching model is in keeping with the fact that in today's world the most important role that English now plays is as a lingua franca between 2L English learners.

This project is able to provide a guidebook for EFL instructors as to the many and varied uses of code switching through compilation, examination and distillation of these research reports. The guidebook takes the form of a concise, functional manual for EFL teachers providing a summary of the collective research findings. The practical focus of the guidebook is to provide a framework of L1 uses in the classroom for the teacher to incorporate as well as, when appropriate, delimit its use. The intent of the guidebook is to fill a gap between the academic research results and currently available reference

materials in order to provide a resource for practicable review purposes when incorporating code switching as a meaningful and productive classroom teaching tools.

Recommendations

The purpose of this project was to examine the forms and functions of code switching used in discourse between bilingual and multilingual speakers, and then to apply these to the functions of teaching English as a foreign language. This project is aimed at the teaching of English to beginning and intermediate students.

Yet one must now bear in mind that communicative competence in the English language learning classroom alone does not equate with communicate competence in other social settings. There is *no single-style speaker* in English (or in any other language for that matter). Even speakers who live in relative isolation display a range of speech styles – that is, they engage in what is known as style shifting as a normal practice dependent upon factors including the speaking environment and communication intent. English 1L speakers vary speech patterns very differently on different occasions. Style shifts involve features on all levels of language use, from the phonological and morphosyntactic features, to intonational contours, lexical items, and pragmatic features, to the way entire conversations are shaped.

With regard to more advanced ESL students, a reintroduction and discussion in L2 of local code switching patterns may provide further necessary capabilities to engage in speech and understanding in the realistic, day-to-day immediate environments in which they live when not in the classroom. Secondly, as the L2 learner progresses into more day-to-day real world competence in the adopted L2 English, a review of the range of speech levels across Standard English would provide a concrete introduction to the realm

outside of the confines of the classroom increasingly incorporating further socio-cultural issues. For example, this might review for instructional purposes the continuing spectrum of levels ranging from most “official” to most “casual” and, at that point, leave an open end for more research. Lastly, looking around the globe, these same factors may be applied to the many varieties of World Englishes.

These points are germane, within the overall code switching context, in acknowledging that there is no clear dividing line between code switching and style shifting, between the English dialect used by one region – on socio-cultural terms – or country – on socio-political terms. Thus, we must continue to broaden the learner’s horizons rather than narrowing them with a sole focus on any one discrete form of “Standard English” alone. For example, dialectal variations of pronunciation and vocabulary; express or implied word and sentence meanings; speech act conventions; awareness of norms of stylistic appropriateness; the use of a language to signal social relationships and with regard to sociolinguistic competence; the interaction in speech with others when uncertain of relative social status.

One must keep in mind that the language classroom is a social group, and a phenomenon related to naturally occurring daily discourse of any social group has the potential to be applicable to and valid for any language classroom. In conclusion, this project suggests the need for teachers to engage in continued consciousness raising as both code switching and style shifting are realities both inside and, moreover, outside the English language classroom itself.

REFERENCES

- ACTFL (2010). Use of target language in the classroom. Retrieved October 1, 2016, from <http://www.actfl.org/news/position-statements/use-the-target-language-in-the-classroom-0>
- Afzal, S. (2013). Using of the first language in English classroom as a way of scaffolding for both the students and teachers to learn and teach English. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Science*, 4(7), 1846-1856. Retrieved from <https://academic.oup.com/eltj/article-abstract/66/3/293/438516/Learner-code-switching-versus-English-only?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
- Ahlberg, A., & Bogunic, A. (2011). *A study of teachers' code-switching in six Swedish EFL classrooms* (Unpublished joint student thesis), Malmö University, Sweden. Retrieved from <http://dspace.mah.se:8080/>
- Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 49-55. doi: 10.5539/elt.v2n2p49
- Anderson K. T., & Toribio, J. A. (2007). Attitudes towards lexical borrowing and intra-sentential code switching among Spanish-English bilinguals. *Spanish in Context*, 4(2), 217-240. Retrieved from <https://liberalarts.utexas.edu/files/1082427>
- Azlan, N. M. N. I., & Narasuman, S. (2013). The role of code switching as a communicative tool in an ESL teacher education classroom. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90, 458-467. Retrieved from www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S187704281302003X

- Anton, M., & DeCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, 314–342. Retrieved from http://0-www.jstor.org.ignacio.usfca.edu/stable/pdf/330338.pdf?_=1467306669223
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241–7. Retrieved from eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/41/4/241.full.pdf
- Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching monolingual classes*. London: Longman.
- Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9–32. doi: 10.2307/3586949
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1982). The construct validation of some components of communicative proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(4), 449-65. Retrieved from englishvls.hunnu.edu.cn/Downloads/LangTst/tst_006.pdf
- Bahous, N. R., Nabhani, B. M., & Bacha, N. N. (2014). Code switching in higher education in a multilingual environment: a Lebanese exploratory study. *Language Awareness*, 23(4), 353-368. doi: 10.1080/09658416.2013.828735
- Barandagh, S. G., Zoghi, M., & Amini, D. (2013). An investigation of teachers and learners' use of English-Persian code switching in Iranian intermediate EFL classrooms. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3(7), 876-883. Retrieved from dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/ijrte/article/view/5000148453
- Baron, D. (1990). *The English only question: An official language for Americans?* New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Bensen, H., & Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2013). Reasons for the teachers' uses of code switching in

- adult EFL classrooms. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(2), pp. 70-82. Retrieved from www.journals.istanbul.edu.tr/iuayefd/article/download/1023022102/1023020685
- Bouangeune, S. (2009). Using L1 in teaching vocabulary to low English proficiency level students: a case study at the University of Laos. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 2(3), 186-193. doi: 10.5539/elt.v2n3p186
- Brooks, F. B., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77, 262–274. Retrieved from eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ485144
- Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL class: death of a dogma. *Language Learning Journal*, 28(1), 29-39. Retrieved from www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09571730385200181
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57, 586–619. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20456910>
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47. Retrieved from ibatefl.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/CLT-Canale-Swain.pdf
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt (Eds). *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.
- Cenoz, J. (2011). “Multilingualism and multilingual education: From monolingual to multilingual perspectives”. Paper presented at 2nd Barcelona Summer School on

Bilingualism and Multilingualism. Barcelona.

Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing.

The Modern Language Journal, 95(3), 356-369. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01206.x

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*.

UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chung, H. H. (2006). Code switching as a communicative strategy: A case study of

Korean-English bilinguals. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 293-307. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2006.10162878

Collingham, M. (1988). Making use of students' linguistic realm. In E. Hoadley-

Maidment (Eds.), *Current issues in teaching English as a second language to adults*. London: Edward Arnold.

Cook, G. (2003). *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the class-room. *Canadian Modern*

Language Review, 57, 402–423. Retrieved from www.est-translationstudies.org/research/2012_DGT/documents/2001_cook.pdf

Cook, V. (2002). *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Costa, F. (2009). *Code-switching in CLIL contexts*. Paper Presented at III Trobada sobre

Semi-Immersi3 a Catalunya. I Taula Rodona Internacional sobre Programes AICLE. Bellaterra.

Crawford, J. (1991). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (2nd ed.).

Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Dujmovi3, M. (2007). The use of Croatian in the EFL classroom. *Metodi3ki Obzori*, 2(3),

91-101. Retrieved from hrcak.srce.hr/file/19437

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal*, 50(4), 303- 311. doi: 10.1093/elt/50.4.303

Ellis, R. (2015). *OAL: Understanding second language acquisition (2nd edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eriksson Barajas, K, Forsberg, C, Wengström, Y. (2013). *Systematiska litteraturstudier I utbildningsvetenskap*. Stockholm: Natur & Kultur.

Evans, N. (2010). *Dying words: Endangered languages and what they have to tell us*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Faltis, C. (1990). New directions in bilingual research design. In Jakobson, R. & Faltis, C. (Eds.). *Distribution Issues in Bilingual Schooling*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Fareed, M., Humayun, S. & Akhtar, H. (2016). English language teachers' code-switching in class: ESL learners' perceptions. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1-11. doi: 10.20547/jess0411604101

Flyman, A. & Burenhult, N. (1999). Code switching in second language teaching of French. Lund University, Department of Linguistics, Working Papers, 47, 59-72.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2014). Using listening journals to raise awareness of global Englishes in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 68(4), 386-396. Retrieved from <https://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/68/4/386>

Gil, M.G., Garau, M.J. & Noguera, J.S. (2012). A case study exploring oral language choice between the target language and the ILs in mainstream CLIL and EFL

secondary education. *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas*, 7, 133-145.

doi: 10.4995/rlyla.2012.1129

Gill, S. (2003). *The L1 in the L2 classroom*. Retrieved at <http://www.hltnmag.co.uk/sep05/mart03.htm>

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.

Greggio, S., & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learner's use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: A qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino*, 10(2), 371-393. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260299540_Teacher's_and_Learners'_Use_of_Code_Switching_in_the_English_as_a_Foreign_Language_Classroom_A_Qualitative_Study

Hall, C. J. (2014). Moving beyond accuracy: From tests of English to tests of “Englishing.” *ELT Journal*, 68(4), 376-385. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccu016

Hay, O. (2015). To switch or not to switch: Code-switching in a multilingual country. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 209, 462 – 469.

Hemmindinger, A. (1987). Two models for using problem-posing and cultural sharing in teaching the Hmong English as a second language and first language literacy. Unpublished master's thesis, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigo.

Hobbs, V., Matsuo, A., & Payne, M. (2010). Code switching in Japanese language classrooms: An exploratory investigation of native vs. non-native speaker teacher practice. *Linguistics and education*, 21(1), 44-59. Retrieved from www.baal.org.uk/proc08/hobbs.pdf

Holthouse, J. (2002). The role of the mother tongue in EFL classrooms. (EFL 授業にお

- ける母国語の役割). Retrieved from https://www.kansai-u.ac.jp/fl/publication/pdf_forum/5/027holthouse.pdf
- Horasan, S. (2014). Code-switching in EFL classrooms and the perceptions of the students and teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(1), 31–45. Retrieved from <http://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/159>
- Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Language difference in writing: Toward a translingual approach. *College English*, 73, 303–321. Retrieved from <https://louisville.edu/faculty/bmhorn01/TranslingualStatement.pdf>
- Horner, B., NeCamp, S., & Donahue, C. (2011). Toward a multilingual composition scholarship: From English only to a translingual norm. *College Composition and Communication*, 63, 269–299. Retrieved from <http://emilylbyers.files.wordpress.com/2011/12/translingual-norm.pdf>
- Howatt, A. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Ianziti, J. R. (2002). *Justifying selected uses of the learners' first language in the foreign language classroom within communicative language teaching*. Paper presented at the Setting the Agenda: Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies in Higher Education Conference, Manchester. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1080281.pdf>
- Iyitoglu, O. (2016). Code-Switching from L2 to L1 in EFL classrooms. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 18(1), 257-289. doi: 10.15516/cje.v18i1.1314
- Jacobson, R. (1976). *Social implications of intra-sentential code-switching*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of South Central Modern Language Association,

Dallas, Texas.

James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*.

London, Longman.

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a lingua franca. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49-85. doi: 10.1515/eip-2015-0003

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' code-switching to the L1 in EFL classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 3(10), 10–23. Retrieved from benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOALJ/TOALJ-3-10.pdf

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kovacic, A., & Kirinic, V. (2011). To use or not to use: first language in tertiary instruction of English as a foreign language. 1st International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, Sarajevo.

Kracht, M. & Klein, U. (2014). The grammar of code switching. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 23, 313–329. doi 10.1007/s10849-014-9190-3

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Lee, M. (2014). Shifting to the World Englishes paradigm by way of the translingual approach: Code-meshing as a necessary means of transforming composition pedagogy. *TESOL Journal*, 5(2), 312-329. doi: 10.1002/tesj.121

Lee, W. (2010). *Codeswitching as a communicative strategy in a Korean heritage*

- language classroom*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. San Diego State University.
- Lightbown, P. M. (2001). Input filters in second language acquisition. In S. Foster-Cohen & A. Nizegorodcew (eds.), *Eurosla Yearbook* (pp. 79-97). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ling, L. Y., Jin, N. Y., Tong, C. S., Tarmizi, M. A., & Sahiddan, N. (2014). Influence of an English lecturer's code-switching practice on students' confidence in the subject. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 4(2), 226–233. doi: 10.20547/jess0411604101
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' code-switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 531–548.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (ed.). *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*. New York, NY: Springer. Doi: 10.1007/0-387-24565-0_5
- Maley, A. (2006). Questions of English. *English Teaching Professional*, 46, 4-6.
- Martin-Jones, M. (1995). Code-switching in the classroom: two decades of research. In: Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.). *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives On Code-Switching* (pp. 90-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mattsson, A., & Burenhult-Mattsson, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers*, 47, 59-72. Retrieved from journals.lub.lu.se/index.php/LWPL/article/viewFile/2322/1897
- McKinley, J., & Sakamoto, M. (2007). Exploring language identity: nature of code-

- switching among Japanese students. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Foreign Studies*, 42(1), 1-28. Retrieved from dept.sophia.ac.jp/fs/pdf/kiyo42/01.pdf
- Meiring, L. & Norman, N. (2002). Back on target: repositioning the status of target language in MFL teaching. *Language Learning Journal*, 26(1), 27-35. Retrieved from www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09571730285200201
- Modupeola, O. (2013). Code-switching as a teaching strategy: Implication for English language teaching and learning in a multilingual society. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 14(3), 92-94. Retrieved from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol14-issue3/P01439294.pdf?id=6710>
- Moore, D. (2002). Case study: code switching and learning in the classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(5), 279-293. doi: 10.1080/13670050208667762
- National Council of Teachers of English (2008). English Language Learners: A Policy Research Brief. <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/PolicyResearch/ELLResearchBrief.pdf> (citing McCarthy, S. J., Garcia, G. E., Lopez-Velasquez, A. M., & Guo, S. H. (2004). Understanding contexts for English language learners. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 38(4), 351-394.)
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press. London
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Piasecka, K. (1988). The bilingual teacher in the ESL classroom. In S. Nicholls & E. Hoadley-Maidment (Eds.), *Current issues in teaching English as a second language to adults* (pp. 97-103). London: Edward Arnold.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rao, Z. (2000). *Effective Use Of The Mother Tongue In TEFL*. Teacher's Edition 3.
- Redouane, R. (2005). Linguistic constraints on code-switching and code-mixing of bilingual Moroccan Arabic-French speakers in Canada. In J. Cohen, K. T. McAlister, K. Rolstad & J. MacSwan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism* (pp. 1921-1933). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Reini, J. (2008). *The functions of teachers' language choice and code switching in EFL classroom discourse*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Jyväskylä.
- Rodriguez, C., & Oxbrow, G. (2008). L1 in the EFL classroom: more a help than a hindrance. *Porta Lingarium*, 9, 93-109. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/28204098_L1_in_the_EFL_classroom_More_a_help_than_a_hindrance
- Rolin—Ianziti, J., & Varshney, R. (2008). Students' views regarding the use of the first language: An exploratory study in a tertiary context maximizing target language use. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 65, 249-273. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.65.2.249
- Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, 42(2014), 308-318. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2013.12.021

- Sampson, A. (2012). Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal*, 66(3), 293- 303. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccr067
- Saraceni, M. (2008). English as a lingua franca: Between form and function. *English Today*, 24, 20-26. doi: 10.1017/S0266078408000163
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca: A complete introduction to the theoretical nature and practical implications of English used as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Selamat, J. T. (2014). *Code switching in the Malaysian ESL classroom*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Otago.
- Seidlitz, L.M. (2003). Functions of code switching in classes of German as a foreign language. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin.
- Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 11(8). Retrieved from <http://www.iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html>.
- Shay, O. (2015). To switch or not to switch: Code-switching in a multilingual country. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 209, 462 – 469. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.253
- Skehan, P. (1995). Analysability, accessibility, and ability for us. In G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer, eds. *Principle and practice in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spahiu, I. (2013). Using Native Language in ESL Classroom. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 1(2), 243-248. Retrieved from www.eltjournal.org

- 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. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/store/10.2307/3588224/asset/3588224.pdf?v=1&t=ipq9v5kn&s=77fc0e1461b8c3d8b0c0271a04938fe9b440d69d>
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass and C. G. Madden (eds). *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M., Kirkpatrick, A. & Cummins, J. (2011). *How to Have a Guilt-free Life Using Cantonese in the English Class: A Handbook for the English Language Teacher in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Research Centre into Language Acquisition and Education in Multilingual Societies, Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 251–274. Retrieved from <http://esatc.hutc.zj.cn/jpkc/om/wx/Task-based%20second%20language%20learning-the%20use%20of%20L1.pdf>
- Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the Language Learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that language right now? Code switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 302-325. doi: 10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00093.x
- Wang, X. J. (2006). Code-switching between Mandarin and English in English-dominant environments. *ARECLS E-Journal*, 3 [online]. Retrieved from <http://www.ecls.ncl.ac.uk/publish/ARECLS/xiaojingwang.htm>.

- Wang, Y. (2013). Non-conformity to ENL norms: A perspective from Chinese English users. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 2(2), 255-282. doi: 10.1515/jelf-2013-0015
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. (2015). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Chapter 2: 27-61. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Language in contact, findings and problems*. New York, NY: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Weschler, R (1997). Uses of Japanese (L1) in the English classroom: Introducing the functional-translation method. *The Internet TESL Journal* 3(11). Retrieved from [http:// www.aitech.ac.jp/~iteslj/Articles/Weschler-UsingL1.html](http://www.aitech.ac.jp/~iteslj/Articles/Weschler-UsingL1.html)
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wolfram, W., & Schilling, N. (2015 3rd ed.). *American English: Dialects and Variation (Language in Society)*. Chapter 10: 387-389. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985). Learning a second language: Chinese children in the American classroom. In J. Alatis & J. Staczek (eds.), *Perspectives on bilingualism and bilingual education* (pp. 17-50). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, 89–100. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x
- Yao, M. (2011). On attitudes to teachers' code-switching in EFL classes. *World Journal*

of English Language, 1(1), 19-29. doi:10.5430/wjel.v1n1p19

Yatağanbaba, E., & Yıldırım, R. (2015). EFL teachers' code switching in Turkish secondary EFL young language learner classrooms. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 7(1), pp. 82-101. doi: 10.5296/ijl.v7i1.6750

Yletyinen, H. (2004). *The functions of code switching in EFL classroom discourse*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Jyväskylä.

Zabrodskaia, A. (2007). Russian-Estonian code switching in the university. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, 14(1), 123-139. Retrieved from <http://w3.coh.arizona.edu/awp/>