学校教育実践学研究，2016，第22巻，171－180頁

Code Switching in the Language Classroom

Brett R. WALTER
(accepted December 7, 2015)

Abstract. The purpose of this study is to explore the current state of using a student's mother tongue (L1) in a foreign language classroom where students are learning another language (L2). More specifically, the study approaches the subject of code switching with two questions: is the inclusion of the L1 in an L2 classroom beneficial or detrimental to student development in language proficiency and, if it is found to be beneficial, is it most effective for semantic language, vocabulary building, or both. The results indicate that overall the benefits of using code switching seem to be greater than possible difficulties that may arise in the classroom from its use. Also, code switching seems to be used most frequently and effectively for vocabulary building, but is often confused for simple borrowing. It is further recommended that a clear definition for code switching is specified that is shared throughout the research on the subject.
Keywords: foreign language teaching, code switching

Introduction

Since the development of the direct method in the early 1960s, instruction in a foreign language has almost always come hand in hand with the idea that the best way for a student to learn a language is for them to be exposed to it as much as possible (Harbord, 1992). This trend was further reinforced by the connectionist model of second language acquisition in which maximum exposure to the L2 is recommended due to its help in speeding up the process of making neural connections to the L1, in turn making that L2 develop its own independent network (Lin, 2012). While this idea is not necessarily flawed, it did lead to many instructors interpreting this as meaning that class should be completely directed in the foreign language (L2), and that use of the first language (L1) should be prohibited. This idea led to the creation of a variety of useful teaching strategies, such as total physical response (TPR), but did not take advantage of one of the greatest tools that a second language learner has at their disposal, as is stated in a number of studies (i.e. White, 2011; Kutz, 1998). By opting to teach only in the second language and by forbidding first language usage, these instructors tried to send their students back to the beginning of their own language development, similar to a child learning their mother tongue. Is this manner of instruction as beneficial for adult learners or even learners who have acquired a high level of proficiency in their first language? Instead of taking advantage of students' knowledge of their mother tongue and correspondences to those with their language, as they naturally do already according to Swain (1985), many instructors did feel (and many still do feel) that this first language would only hinder second language learning.

However, many studies of bilingual language development exist which discuss the idea of code switching and code mixing and the many uses of such by bilingual speakers, perhaps of greatest note being Baker (2011) who lists thirteen common uses. It has been found that one such usage of the L1 in an L2 situation included the need to explain a word without having a full range of vocabulary available in the L2. While this use may be more common in learners who have learned their languages through simultaneous acquisition, it has also been found that later language learners may often use this strategy once they have reached a certain level of L2 proficiency. Looking at language learning from the perspective of language instruction and these

sequential language learners, and considering the benefits that instruction in the L1 could hold for them, this report hopes to clarify whether or not the inclusion of code switching in instruction would be beneficial or detrimental to the proficiency and comprehension of the L2. Further, if the use of code switching would be beneficial for learners of a second language, would it most benefit semantic language, vocabulary building, or both?

In order to fully explore the possibilities of code switching in the classroom, we must first look at the current definitions of the phrase and how this definition is maintained across the range of research on the topic itself. Once a definition of code switching has been determined, we can then begin to look at some of the research that explores the benefits or negatives of the use of code switching to help answer our first question stated above. Finally, the report will look more specifically at code switching in the classroom and consider the variety of uses that have been considered in some of the research to date.

Defining Code Switching

One of the largest difficulties with most research in the area of code switching is that the term has been interpreted in a number of ways. All are similar in manner, simply put as the insertion of the L1 in an L2 learning situation, but begin to differ when considering more specific aspects of the usage (including number of words switched and purpose for switching). Collin Baker specifies a difference between one word or a few words being changed in a sentence (labeled "code mixing") and code switching, which he defines as having "generally been used to describe any switch within the course of a single conversation, whether at word or sentence level or at the level of blocks of speech" (Baker, 2011, p. 107). Celik (2003) divides the definitions based on the number of words switched. He defines code-mixing similarly to the definition mentioned above; "a phenomenon in which a word or an expression from one language is used in a group of words whose structure belongs to another distinct language." This is followed by a clarification of the differences between code-mixing and code switching, which is defined as when "complete sentences from both languages follow each other" (Celik, 2003, p. 361).

In other research, the authors take the stance that code switching is a feature of bilingual speech and not a sign of a deficiency in either language of the speaker. Further, code switching is defined as "the systematic alternating use of two languages or language varieties within a single conversation or utterance" (Liebscher& Dailey-O'Cain, 2005, p. 235). This definition could also be equated to the code-mixing definitions mentioned above.

In her article looking at some possible downsides to code switching, Sarah J. Shin (2002) looks at the use of English found in Korean classrooms and makes a differentiation between code switching, which may be beneficial for language acquisition, and simple word borrowing, which often has little to no educational benefits. In her article, Shin takes efforts to create a more explicit definition of code switching, as often the act of borrowing is confused for a code switch. This is interesting, as the difference is rarely defined in other studies, and if it is not taken into account the data may be skewed.

Shin begins the article by further clarifying the difference between the two by stating that "borrowing is the adaptation of lexical material to the patterns of the recipient language, [and] code switching [is] the juxtaposition of sentence fragments formed according to the internal syntactic rules of two distinct systems" (Shin, 2002, p. 337-338). Classifying single word switches (most commonly found in most code switching research, especially when looking at the use of vocabulary specifically) is then difficult to accomplish, as there are no patterns used to show the purpose of using the lexical item. Shin quotes other researchers as making distinctions between the two by looking at how integrated the item has become in the first language. What this means is that if the word can be understood in either language (sharing phonetic qualities and meaning), it is considered a borrowed

word and not an instance of code switching. While it seems that the past research has created fairly strict designations for the difference between the two, Shin points out that it mostly covers language use in adults without looking at how this differs from the use of code switching in children. It is this gap in the literature that Shin hoped to close.

It was determined that almost all uses of English nouns in the direct object positions were borrowings, and that the lack of pronouns found also suggests that the students were conversing using only these borrowings. Shin warns that automatically labeling instances of a second language as code switching may create an inaccurate image of what that means. It would seem that in this article, what we have labeled as code mixing from previous articles can not necessarily be defined as a form of code switching and therefore may not necessarily have benefits for language acquisition (in the case that this borrowing is actually occurring). While we have seen some difficulties with defining code switching, we have also seen that it is defined in generally the same manner, and as such, the current article will also define code switching as any case when the L1 is substituted during an utterance of the L2, with the exception of those words that have been adopted or 'borrowed' by the L2.

Code Switching: Beneficial or Detrimental?

Now that the idea of code switching and some of the difficulties with defining it have been considered, we can look more into answering our first research question of whether or not the use of code switching (in the classroom or in general) is beneficial for the acquisition of a second language. In his article mentioned above, Celik (2003) goes into a discussion about the use of a first language when instructing a second language course, which has recently seen a much more negative connotation (particularly with the communicative approach, which "typically frown[s] upon" it) than was evident in traditional language instruction. Celik supports the use of the L1 in the classroom by referencing practitioners who believe that this use of the L1 is beneficial when used carefully and in a limited manner. Although Celik states that the use of translation in the classroom, while quick and easy for presenting new information, may not encourage students to build deeper connections between the words in the L1 and L2, he justifies this usage by making a connection to the findings of another researcher. Schmidt (1990) states that in order to attain conscious learning in an L2, a student must be aware of the learning, notice the item to be learned, have an understanding, have the ability to articulate or use the new item, and process the new item in short term memory. Celik suggests that in a speaking class, this can be accurately accomplished through the use of this "translation" method, making use of code switching to introduce new words and provide a solid connection to that word for the students.

Grit Liebscher and Jennifer Dailey-O'Cain (2005) looked at a different use of code switching found in learners of German. What separates this study from other studies done on the use of code switching in the classroom is that it looks at the usage found in an advanced level class discussing content based beyond just language. In other words, the participants of the study were at an advanced level of proficiency in their L2 and were using that L2 for discourse-related functions. During their classes students either discussed readings provided by the instructor, or gave a presentation in the L2 which was also followed up by a discussion of the content.

For this study, the researchers made sure that the class was in what is called a *community of practice*, stating that students are not only informed that they are allowed to use English as well as German, but (even though the syllabus is written in German, and the teacher uses German almost exclusively) the teacher also goes through some of the uses of the L1 (such as for adding emphasis to a question, for clarification, as a method for repair, and as a cue for language retrieval) in this L2 focused class. By creating this community of practice, the researchers have created a situation where the focus of the class is not only on learning the content of the literature, but also to provide an opportunity for self-regulated

language improvement. It is in this type of atmosphere that natural code switching is most likely to occur, without fear of repercussions for its use.

Through the results of the research it was found that students were using this code switching not only as a support for their L2 knowledge (as in situations where they are unable to express the meaning they wish to get across in the L2), but also in discourse-related functions that helped them clarify meanings of the material they were studying. Further, they found that the type of code switching used by the participants was similar to that which was previously only found in either teacher talk or bilinguals in a non-academic setting. Through these results, further benefits of the inclusion of the L1 and code switching in the classroom can be seen, as these students were not only comprehending some of the more difficult aspects of the language, but were also able to improve their language usage because of the feeling of freedom in language use created in the classroom.

Mark Hancock (1997) also looked at language use in discussions and hoped to provide more information on the use of code switching in the classroom. In his article, Hancock looks specifically at the use of the L1 by students in a language class during small group discussions. Although he states that it has been determined in previous research that "negotiation between learners is an important benefit of group work" (Hancock, 1997, p. 218), he hopes with his research to clarify the difference between those groups found in classrooms with students from different L1 backgrounds (as in an English language learning program) and those with students who all share their L1 (which he hypothesizes may decrease the benefits of group discussion). He does so by recording two sets of learners attending an intensive summer program in Madrid.

For the research, Hancock assigns students two different tasks, the first being a role play in a restaurant and the second being a role play in a guesthouse, both of which are performed in the L2. For the assessment, the recorded data are divided by time spent in the active role and time spent discussing the role play and planning to perform it. The results of the study showed that in group work, code switching is used in a number of ways that are not necessarily all bad. Further, Hancock states that "when the learners select the L1 by default, there is a good chance that awareness-raising activities will persuade the learners to employ the target language instead" (Hancock, 1997, p. 233). He classifies the other forms of code switching as those that occur on accident or for a particular communicative purpose, and states that these types of usage of the L1 are less likely to be eliminated through instruction.

Hancock describes the use of the L1 in group work as almost a form of motivation, claiming that "some L1 interjections are a natural by-product of charge in the interaction, and that charge could all too easily be diffused by an inflexible insistence on the L2" (Hancock, 1997, p. 233). Thus, this study not only shows some of the positive uses for code switching in the classroom, but also provides a view of some different uses, beyond language acquisition, for code switching. Hancock provides examples of how L1 insertions can be used as a useful communication strategy.

While code switching may seem to lend itself to use for vocabulary instruction (as the students need only focus on a difference in single words that do not necessarily pose an acquisition problem in terms of context), the use of code switching in longer utterances has yet to explicitly be seen. Zheng Lin (2012) begins his research by looking at L2 language learning and some of the theories that exist on the effects of the L1 when learning a second language. Lin mentions the social cultural theory of language acquisition, in which the mind is seen as using "tools" to mediate various mental processes, so that in a first language situation, the L1 is mediated with such things as language, signs, or symbols in that L1 context, and the L2 is similarly mediated in that L2 context, but usually based off of previous knowledge. In other words, the development of the L2 uses the L1, a pre-existing "tool," to mediate language learning and is thus fairly dependent on the L1. Lin also references

connectionism, in which the brain is considered a network of connected neurons, similar to the idea of schemata. In this case as well, a second language first develops as an extension of the L1, and as proficiency increases in the L2 its own system of neurons is created. In this theory, in order to quickly create this independent system of the L2, maximum exposure to the L2 is required. Lin also mentions the developmental linguist perspective, and relates it to the interaction of children with the teacher in a kindergarten classroom. In such a situation, the teacher is providing more information to shape the child' s language development, and so naturally, these children will use their L1 to make connections to the L2 presented in the class.

Lin continues to quote some articles looking at similar concepts as those discussed above (Cummins, 2001; Hickey, 2009; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Anton & DiCamilla 1999; Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009), but it all leads to the question of whether or not this L1 is truly a "crucial psychological tool that enables learners to construct effective collaborative dialogue" and if it "offers a quick and efficient way for learners to work out the meaning of unknown words" (Lin, 2012, p. 367). More specifically, Lin looks at how the use of the L1 and code switching in an L2 language game affects acquisition, noticing, and activation of prior knowledge of the L2 in children at the kindergarten level. The kindergarten classes participated in a game of "Simon says," where the teacher performed the instruction in one of three ways: completely in the L2, completely in the L1, and by using the L2 and code switching to the L1 when it was absolutely necessary.

Through a combination of observations of student success in the activity and interviews of the teachers, Lin determines that the ideal teaching situation for the L2 in this kindergarten setting was the inclusion of the L1 for moments of confusion when providing instruction in the L2. This is determined by the facts that they found the complete L1 group performing the task perfectly but not really being exposed to the L2 (and as such not really retaining the L2 information), and the complete L2 group getting a large amount of exposure to the L2 but often failing to engage learners' noticing and prior knowledge for the purposes of intake (often leading to a disinterest in the instruction and activity). Further, the mixed L1-L2 group seemed to optimize the instruction, as the teacher was able to provide L2 instruction while controlling moments of confusion with the L1, leading to more student interaction and comprehension. Through Lin's results, we can see some evidence to the usefulness and benefits of code switching in the second language classroom (especially from the perspective of the instructor), while at the same time see some possible negative effects of instruction only in the L2.

In contrast to some of the findings in regards to longer discourse and code switching, other research has shown that it does not necessarily hold either the same positive image of aiding instruction or the necessarily strong benefits of L1 inclusion in instruction. Lucie Viakinnou-Brinson, Carol Herron, Steven P. Cole, and Carrie Haight attempt to tackle what they label as the "center of the target language (TL) and code-switching debate" (Viakinnou-Brinson et al., 2012, p. 72). They look into the use of code switching in grammar instruction and whether this inclusion of the L1 is beneficial for students attempting to attain grammar in the L2.

This study was actually a portion of a larger study on the short-term and long-term effects of instructional conditions on grammar acquisition. As a result, this study focused mostly on the long-term effects, meaning that they considered scores between pre-tests and post-tests to answer their research questions of whether or not there is a difference between student scores from French only classes and those in a French/English class. While seeming to be based on quantitative data, the study also takes a look at some qualitative information by trying to find what the personal instructional language preferences of the students found in each of these two environments are. The participants of the study were 40 students of a beginning French language course, all of whom were placed in one of four classes at their university. Instruction involved

the watching of a video in the L2 (*French in Action*) for 10 minutes, which was followed by 40 minutes of language instruction.

Although this research was conducted over the course of a semester, the study itself was only performed on ten target days, in which a TA from a visiting school would come and provide instruction in either the L2 only or code switching L1/L2 manner. The effects of this instruction were measured by a pretest, given before grammar instruction, and a posttest, given at the end of the semester after all grammar instruction (including those which were not part of this study) had been completed. The students were also interviewed to get information on their feelings about the types of instruction and how they thought it affected their language learning. The findings of the study revealed that while the students showed a preference for instruction in the L2 with some usage of the L1 for clarification, the pre- and post-test results were strongly in favor of the French-only condition.

Considering the findings of the above research, we turn again to our question of finding out how grammar instruction at the higher, multiple-word level can be assisted by the use of code switching. These findings do a good job of showing that although code switching can be beneficial for simple vocabulary development it does not hold great benefits when used for grammar instruction. Further, it shows that even though many students feel that the use of the L1 benefitted their learning, this should not be considered a fact.

Although research exists that reports students showing a preference for the use of L1 particularly at lower L2 proficiency levels (Carson & Kashihara, 2012), it has often been mentioned in this article that this opinion is not shared by many instructors (White, 2011; Leibscher & O'Cain, 2005). The research performed by Setati, Adler, Reed, and Bapoo (2002) utilizes English, Science, and Mathematics classes in South Africa to give a picture of how code switching may be used in a practical setting and how many teachers in these scenarios view the use of the first language. More specifically, the research explores language practices of teachers at ten different schools and their use of code switching, exploratory talk, and discourse-specific talk. Before looking at the use of code switching in these schools, however, the authors describe the effect that the learning environment has on this use and the abilities of its teachers and learners. A line is drawn between rural and urban schools. This research takes place in a unique environment (which may skew some of the results) in that South Africa is split between two languages. In these rural areas, students are not exposed to much English outside of the academic setting, and as such the English is almost like a second language. The urban areas, by contrast, provide many more opportunities for students and teachers to be exposed to the English language outside of school (billboards, newspapers, etc.), and thus the authors label this English as an additional language.

The results of the study, assessed through an observation schedule and in-depth interviews, were divided and discussed in four different areas; changing of code switching practices in the classroom over three years, teachers' views on code switching, differences across the teaching and learning contexts, and differences between subjects. For the changing of code switching use, it was observed that in the public domain students used English in a limited manner while teachers mostly used English for general instruction and interaction with individuals or small groups. The greatest difference noticed was the amount of group work in the classes, which led to students speaking a bit more English but, due to the communicative nature of the activities, writing it a lot less, thus leading to incomplete development of discourse-specific and written English. As for teacher opinions, while many teachers felt that the use of code switching allowed them to communicate with the students in a much more efficient manner, others felt that the use of code switching should really not happen, but for comprehension sake they had no other choice but to use the L1.

The researchers conclude that while code

switching is used in the classroom intentionally, it is not always done so without dilemma, especially when instruction is done in a context of strong dominance of English. It is worthwhile to notice that the language classrooms had much less difficulty with the code switching than the science or mathematics classes. This could lead us to believe that for the purpose of language acquisition in particular, code switching does not necessarily have these drawbacks found in content-based classes.

Code Switching in Instruction

As has been seen in the articles discussed above, the overall consensus in much of the current research is that code switching does have some benefits when used in the right manner in the classroom. As it has been determined that there are indeed these benefits in the classroom, attention can now be shifted to the second question posed in the beginning of this article. That question hopes to define to what degree code switching in instruction can aid classroom semantics and vocabulary building. Celik (2003) was also interested in finding whether the use of code-mixing in the classroom would aid students, particularly in vocabulary acquisition. He provides an insight into the usefulness of code-mixing by mentioning that it is "free from the formality, the direct attention, and the extra work of [direct vocabulary teaching]" (Celik, 2003, p. 361).

In his article, Celik takes a large shift from the traditional language classroom by suggesting that presenting the target information (in this case new vocabulary words) via storytelling provides a stronger connection in student schemata, as that new word is also presented in a context for reference. Using this storytelling method, Celik talked with the students about a certain subject in the L1 while replacing the key vocabulary by using the L2 in positions where they would be used. These vocabulary words were always followed up by a reiteration of the word in the L1, providing students with an immediate translation of the unknown word. After the "storytelling," students were tasked first with an oral task where they were to talk about the story in pairs, without explicit instructions to use the new vocabulary. Celik did, however, observe that even without being told to do so the target vocabulary was being used by the students. The students were then expected to write down what they had discussed as a second writing task and for further internalization of the target vocabulary.

The results of the study showed that many students were using the vocabulary even though they were not required to do so, and for the most part the usage of the vocabulary was accurate. Celik concludes with a statement similar to those mentioned above. This is that the use of code-mixing in instruction did not seem to have any negative effects on student acquisition, and while not all students used the new vocabulary in the tasks, those that did showed only gains in their understanding of the words. With his innovative use of storytelling to introduce new vocabulary, Celik has provided evidence of some more focused uses of code switching that would help students with their vocabulary. Already, through this research, we can see a partial answer to the research question of the relationship between code switching and instruction, and, assuming that it is a goal of instruction of that language class, how it can help students with vocabulary retention. However, the question remains how this code switching can assist in more complicated aspects of language acquisition, or through different types of activities.

In his article, White (2011) presents a view of many English teachers that we have already seen mentioned quite a number of times above. This is the view that only proper English should be allowed in the classroom. White continues to state that this view is incorrect insofar that the definition of "proper English" is completely based off of current trends in the language. White suggests that while this English may not be what is expected, teaching students how to code-switch is one of the best ways to allow them to build upon their current understanding of the language.

White presents three different activities performed

in the classroom that show students the importance and convenience of code switching. He does this with the hope that through these activities the teachers will understand the difficulty that many students have when presented with a situation where they are only allowed to use one specific language. The first activity has students attempt to read text in an archaic form of English. Through this activity, the student becomes aware of how linguistically alienated a student may become without the use of their L1. The second activity had the students "translate" lyrics from a popular song into what is considered "proper" English, and then comment on the effect that this translation had on the original meaning and emotion of the song lyrics. This gave students a chance to practice a form of code switching, by comparing their native language with another form of it, while showing them possible reasons that a student would feel the need to code-switch. The third activity had students work on an interpretation task in which most students ended up giving up on. This can show some negative effects of instruction that restricts language use to only the L2, as students may lose motivation to learn.

Although White's article did not look at the use of code switching in an L1 to L2 sense that we have seen thus far, it does give an insight into some activities that may be used in a classroom. These activities were designed to show some of the difficulties of performing in an academic setting without being permitted to use the L1 (or without being allowed to code switch), but they can easily be converted to also teach new vocabulary or grammar. Reading and translation activities are commonly found in the classroom, but if used similarly to Celik's storytelling method it could help with individual vocabulary or target grammar. The song translation activity may also be useful as it makes the learning of the language more entertaining for the learners. Thus far we have seen mostly negative connotations with the use of code switching outside of a language course context. It is also worthwhile to see how code switching can be effective outside of these classes.

David Chen-On Then and Su-Hie Ting (2011) looked at the use of code switching outside of the typical L2 classroom. They begin the article by quoting a number of other instances of research that have shown the usefulness of using code switching when teaching a subject besides language. Most of these studies explain that the use of code switching was for the focus on the content and to aid students in comprehending the academic language specific to that content. They then continue the article by explaining the model of code switching that their current research is based upon, conversational code switching. The idea is that code switching in class is used for a number of reasons, including encouragement for open and free discussion among students, a difference in the contextual situations between the same individuals, quotation, interjections, reiterations, and message qualification.

The researchers looked at each instance of code switching and classified it as one of the areas listed above to try and figure out which type of code switching is more common in a language or content area classroom. The researchers discovered that in their study the main reasons for code switching in conversational situations are reiteration and quotation. These reiterations include message repetitions for words, concepts, or instruction, with some direct translations aimed at understanding of the concept being taught and to maintain student compliance. In general, the researchers conclude that code switching even on the part of the instructors facilitates learning. These results are a stark contrast to the findings of Setati et al. (2002), and show us where some areas of the current research may still need further clarification.

Discussion and Implications

The purpose of this research was not only to clarify some of the current problems with the idea of code switching (the largest of which is a seemingly varying definition of the term and its different forms), but also to look at whether or not the use of code switching, a common occurrence in simultaneous bilinguals, is beneficial for sequential

bilinguals when learning a second language. The research also hoped to find any current instructional practices that may aid teachers of a second language in including code switching in their classrooms, assuming that the use of code switching was proven to be beneficial. The results were only slightly varied across different studies, with most sharing a common answer, especially with regards to the benefits of code switching.

The first research question posited in the introduction was whether or not the use of code switching in the classroom was beneficial for learners of a second language. Although there were some downsides found in the research, particularly when using code switching to attempt teaching more complicated grammatical structures, the benefits seemed to be greater (Viakinnou-Branson et al., 2012; Leibscher & O'Cain, 2005). The research seems to only caution that code switching use be at least partially controlled for the purpose of language learning, as students may not use it to its greatest advantage when expected to do it alone or in small groups. If planned properly, and the students are given strategies for using the code switching, the benefits far outweigh the downsides (Hancock, 1997; Lin, 2012; Celik, 2003; Leibscher & O'Cain, 2005).

The affirmative results found for the first research question leads us to consider the second research question, which looked more at which types of language learning could benefit the most from the inclusion of code switching in instruction. As mentioned above, it seems that the greatest benefit for code switching is in building student vocabulary, as often differences in shorter utterances are more noticeable. We are warned, however, that this use of code switching (or code mixing) can easily be confused with simple borrowing, which uses more of the newly developed definition of a word than the definition found in the language of origin for that word. Further, such activities as storytelling, music translation, and even (when used appropriately) content based activities can be used to support both instruction and language learning (Celik, 2003; White, 2011; Setati et al., 2002).

One thing we have not considered in this research is the difference between code switching in those simultaneous bilinguals and later learners of a second language. As this article has looked at the use of code switching in second language instruction in particular, to what degree can we expect our students to use this strategy with the required skill for accuracy? Ursula Lanvers (2001) considered the development of these code switching skills, specifically in infants who are born and raised in a multilingual setting and concludes that "many forms of children's language switching were identified as displaying the same linguistic properties and serving the same functions as observed in adult switching" (Lanvers, 2001, p. 461). While these uses were not exactly the same (as some children in general have a more limited vocabulary and have a tendency to use terms they prefer, as in favorite items), this study also shows a general structure for introducing types of code switching methods to the L2 learner that may be used in the classroom. These findings raise more questions about whether or not, and if so how, a truly authentic form of code switching can be found in the language classroom, and whether or not this code switching, even when done authentically, should be compared to the code switching used by native bilinguals.

References

Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F. J. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 83*(2), 233.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5th Edition, Buffalo, Multilingual Matters.

Carson, E., & Kashihara, H. (2012). Using the L1 in the L2 classroom: The students speak. *The Language Teacher, 36*(4), 41-48.

Celik, M. (2003). Teaching vocabulary through code-mixing. *ELT Journal, 57*(4), 361-369.

Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society, 2nd ed.*

Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Hancock, M. (1997). Behind classroom code switching: Layering and language choice in L2 learner interaction. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(2), 217-235.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal, 46*(4), 350-355.

Hickey, T. (2009). Code-switching and borrowing in Irish. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 13*(5), 670.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kutz, E. (1998). Between students' language and academic discourse: Interlanguage as middle ground. *Negotiating Academic Literacies: Teaching and Learning across Cultures. Ed. Vivian Zamel and Ruth Spack*. Mahwah: Erlbaum. 37-50.

Lanvers, U. (2001). Language alternation in infant bilinguals: A developmental approach to codeswitching. *The International Journal of Bilingualism: Cross-Disciplinary, Cross-Linguistic Studies of Language Behavior, 5*(4), 437-464.

Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal (Boulder, Colo.), 89*(2), 234-247.

Lin, Z. (2012). Code-switching: L1-coded mediation in a kindergarten foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Early Years Education, 20*(4), 365-378.

Setati, M., Adler, J., Reed, Y., & Bapoo, A. (2002). Incomplete journeys: Code-switching and other language practices in mathematics, science, and English language classrooms in South Africa. *Language and Education, 16*(2), 128-149.

Shin, S. (2002). Differentiating language contact phenomena: Evidence from Korean-English bilingual children. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 23*(3), 337-360.

Swain, M. (1985). A critical look at the communicative approach (2). *ELT Journal, 39*(2), 76-87.

Then, D., & Ting, S. (2011). Code-switching in English and science classrooms: More than translation. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 8*(4), 299-323.

Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Viakinnou-Brinson, L., Herron, C., Cole, S., & Haight, C. (2012). The effect of target language and code-switching on the grammatical performance and perceptions of elementary-level college French students. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(1), 72-91.

White, J. (2011). De-centering English: Highlighting the dynamic nature of the English language to promote the teaching of code-switching. *English Journal, 100*(4), 44-49.