



The Effect of Code-Switching on the Improving of Speaking Skill of Iranian Intermediate EFL Learner: State of Art

Parvaneh Yarahmadi

Islamic Azad University of Damavand.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 1 October 2016;

Received in revised form:

4 November 2016;

Accepted: 14 November 2016;

Keywords

Code-switching,
Grammatical Structure.

ABSTRACT

In recent years the structures of code-switching like its grammatical structure, have become crucial on in bilingualism research. Researchers in this field discuss the types of code-switching structures that are possible within a given data set. In the work, code-switching of different structures have been discussed.

© 2016 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

Most researchers, who have paid attention to code-switching, have however been concerned with the sociological interpretation and discourse functions, i.e. the socio-pragmatic aspect, of code-switching. For this reason, linguists who do not specialize in bilingualism often automatically assume that research in code-switching means sociolinguistic research. It is certainly an interesting issue to investigate when and why a speaker chooses one linguistic variety rather than another: this can be explained by stylistic or metaphorical motivation, where factors such as the interlocutor, social role, domain, topic, venue, medium, and type of interaction play an important role. In this case, language alternation can also serve as a conversational cue, expressing attitudes towards language or marking linguistic identity (Keller 1995, Auer 1998).

Only in recent years the structures of code-switching like its grammatical structure, have become crucial on in bilingualism research (Scotton 2002,p.10). Researchers in this field discuss the types of code-switching structures that are possible within a given data set. In the field of code-switching different structures have been discussed. It is possible to indicate the root structure of language systems by explaining code-switching elements, i.e. the transition from one language to the other is possible. This approach can be described as code-switching (Auer 1998,p.3). Beside this merely systematic aspect, there is a third approach to code-switching that has not yet been widely considered, but which has been discussed by Michael Clyne in a number of his publications (e.g. Clyne 1967, 1991, 2003). This third aspect is psycho linguistically motivated code-switching:

In language alternation the usage of specific conditions of language production is more important than the speaker's intention. In this case the focus of discussion is taking place in the speaker's brain so the use of language (as in the sociolinguistic ally conditioned approach) and the system (as in the grammatical approach) are not focused that much: lexical items that are similar or identical in both languages can

function as a trigger for the alternation from one language to another. Such instances indicate the processes of mental representation of bilingualism on the one hand and bilingual language processing on the other. The speaker in socio-pragmatically conditioned code-switching does not alter the language with a specific conversational aim. This means that the code-switching has no function in the local conversational context, especially when the "global interactional behaviour" (Franceschini 1998,p.61) is based on code-switching, i.e. when languages or codes are not obvious in a given context (Franceschini 1998,p.58 speaks of "non-functional uses of CS [= code-switching]"). Because of the obvious difference between these two types of code-switching some scholars have suggested giving them different names: the term code-switching should be used only for socio-pragmatically conditioned code alternation, whereas the psycholinguistically conditioned type should be termed "code-mixing" (for instance Berruto 1990) or "language mixing" (Auer 1999). But as Franceschini (1998,p.59) points out, this does not "present a satisfactory answer, as the basic problem remains: The speakers do use CS [= code-switching] but in bilingual speech we also have to take into account that both kinds of code-switching can occur within the same utterance, and it is sometimes difficult to decide which type of code-switching we are confronted with. Moreover, it is still up to the speaker whether he/she decides to continue the utterance in that language or to switch back to the base-language again, beside considering the facilitate transition to the other language. In this paper the researcher shall concentrate on psycho linguistically motivated code-switching and explain its implications for mental processes: in the first part she will provide instances of psycho linguistically conditioned code-switching by listing the various types of lexical items that can trigger code alternation. To explain these data the researcher will subsequently consider the cognitive prerequisites that can demonstrate the plausibility of the effects. she will provide instances of psycho linguistically

conditioned code-switching by listing the various types of lexical items that can trigger code alternation. To explain these data the researcher will subsequently consider the cognitive prerequisites that can demonstrate the plausibility of the effects. She will present a model of the mental representation of bilingual speech production that can clarify the complicated codes and languages in the bilingual brain. Although the intention of the speaker in psycholinguistically conditioned code-switching differs from pragmatically conditioned language alternation, there are differences between language users concerning the frequency of language alternation. The researcher will argue in the last part of this article that this variation can be explained by the language awareness of the speaker, which is the concepts of monitoring processes and linguistic awareness come into play.

2.2. Code switching

The term code-switching was developed by Gumperz (1982, as cited in Zabrodskaja, 2007) and refers to verbal or non-verbal choices of forms within a communicative participation which speakers recognize as 'marked' since to make their communication more real and practical. Numan and Carter (2001) also define the term as "a phenomenon of switching from one language to another in the same discourse" (p. 275).

Code-switching can be considered in relation to language oral ability acquisition. Although switching languages during a conversation may be disruptive to the listener, when the speaker switches due to an inability to express her/himself, it does provide an opportunity for language development. According to Skiba (1997) "samples of language which are appropriate for language development can signal the need of appropriate samples of code-switching" (p. 3). The listener, in this case, is able to extract the message despite the translated piece which in turn will allow for a reduced amount of switching and less following interferences as it goes. These principles may also be applied in the second language classroom. Code-switching may be put into the communication activities used for the teaching of a second language. Along the same vein Ife (2007) argues that code-switching shows the target language input with other linguistic resources in the early stages especially in the adult language learning. Nonetheless, Ife notifies that it is not contrary to the subject of maximizing L2 input in SLA, but a subject in favor of L1 as a resource in SLA learning. The systematic studies of learners' code-switching by Arnfast and Jørgensen (2003) indicate code-switching may lead to a bilingual competence in learners within the first year of intensive training.

During the 1970s and 1980s it was assumed that code-switching in the classroom was a counterproductive phenomenon, which is meant how to prevent it and how to use more the target language. It was not until The 1990s that the use of code-switching as a contextualization cue was studied. Reasons for code-switching put forward include the socializing role of the teacher, the importance of variation and repetition, and the teacher's linguistic competence and insecurity. Bergman (1993) for the first time discusses issues of conscious, planned code-switching among teachers in Swedish schools with bilingual education in Swedish and Finnish. Other accounts include Martin-Jones (1995) who revises who reviews research in bilingual education programs in the context of classroom code-switching. Code-switching may be conducted in the second language classroom for the following reasons: (a) Linguistic insecurity, e.g. the difficulty

teachers experience in relating new concepts, discussed by Merritt et al. (1992), (b) Topic switch, i.e. when the teacher switches code according to the topic under discussion. It might be suggested, for instance, explaining grammar instruction in mother tongue (Flyman- Mattsson, 1997), (c) Affective functions, e.g. spontaneous expression of emotions and emotional understanding in discourse with students (Flyman-Mattsson & Burenhult-Mattsson, 1999), (d) Socializing, i.e. when teachers turn to the students' first language to signal friendship and solidarity (Merritt et al., 1992), and (e) Repeating, i.e. when teachers convey the same message in both languages for clarity.

As pointed out above, most of the previous research on code-switching deals with natural discourse, not with classroom interaction and we might expect classroom code-switching to differ in several important respects from code-switching in natural discourse. Speaking activities in classroom especially communicative activities help learners transfer learned language to acquired store "In a relatively small Puerto Rican neighborhood in New Jersey, some people freely used code-switching styles and extreme forms of borrowing both in everyday casual talk and in even more formal gatherings. Other local residents were careful to speak only Spanish with a minimum of loans on formal occasions. Others again spoke mainly English, using Spanish or code-switching styles only with small children or with neighbors." (John J. Gumperz and Jenny Cook-Gumperz, "Introduction: Language and the Communication of Social Identity." *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982)

2.2.1. Code-Switching and Language Change

"The role of CS, along with other instrument of communication, in language change is still a matter of discussion. On the one hand the relationship between communication and language change is now generally acknowledged: just a few researcher agree the traditional view that change follows universal, language-internal principles such as simplification, and takes place in the absence of communication with other varieties (James Milroy 1998). On the other hand, some researchers still downplay the role of CS in change, and contrast it with borrowing, which is seen as a form of convergence." (Penelope Gardner-Chloros, "Contact and Code-Switching." *The Handbook of Language Contact*, ed. by Raymond Hickey. Blackwell, 2010).

In order for fundamental questions such as 'why do people code-switch?' and 'what are the functions of this code-switching phenomenon?' to be answered, researchers developed various theories from a variety of perspectives. Blom and Gumperz's study (1972) in early studies considered these questions from a social approach and later on Myers-Scotton's (1993a) Markedness Model, among others. Blom and Gumperz (1972) distinguish between Situational and Metaphorical switching. The former occurs when participants find themselves in different situations, where a change in code is required but not necessarily a change in topic, while the latter happens when a change of topic requires a change in the language used. Later on, Gumperz (1982, p.131) elaborates on the discourse function and interactional dynamics of CS showing that CS is an additional resource for bilinguals and considers CS a type of contextualization cue, which signals 'what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows. Myers-Scotton (1993a) proposed the Markedness model to

show that certain code choices of the speakers depend on the situation and the social roles they assume. She distinguishes between marked and unmarked CS: 'code choices can be used as more or less marked' (Myers-Scotton, 1993a,p.82). Unmarked CS can be a shift from one unmarked choice for a negotiation of a change in the rights and obligations (sequential marked CS) or the use of two or more codes as the unmarked choice to show the speaker's identification with more than one identity (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). The key points of the model is that language choices are indexical as part of their competence (markedness/metric evaluator) and negotiation principle (Myers-Scotton, 1993a).

Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model is a kind of comprehensive theory which connects to social motivations of code-switching cross-culturally. Although this pays attention to variety of disciplines, such as sociology of language and linguistic anthropology and differs from Gumperz's view in a number of ways, it shares with Gumperz and other scholars the notion that each code is socially meaningful and relates to social groups, stances, or values.

Both CS frameworks have been criticised, but as Gafaranga (2007b) puts it, the different models of CS 'rather than being seen as competitive and in terms of one being better than the others, [they] should be seen as complementary. No approach can be exhaustive' (p. 307).

There is another group of code-switching researchers, however, who work within the framework of conversation analysis (CA) and do not necessarily resort to the fact that functions of CS lie in social factors. They believe that the meaning of code-switching emerges out of the sequential development of the conversational interaction. Although Auer and Gumperz share the view that code-alternation should be analysed under the framework of contextualisation cues, their approach on how this is accomplished differs. To Gumperz, it is precisely the symbolic social meanings attached to each code that enable conversational participants to interpret instances of code-switching, while Auer (1998), on the other hand, considers that the situated meaning of CS can only be revealed by carrying out a sequential analysis, understating the macro dimensions of CS. Auer distinguishes between discourse-related code-switching, defined as 'the use of code-switching to organize the conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance' (1998: 4) and preference-related switching which frequently has to do with extra-conversational knowledge.

According to Auer (1984) a conversation analytic approach to code-switching has at least two advantages compared to other approaches. First, the sequence of the conversation is prior to the influence of the turns that are being exchanged. Second, it 'limits the external analysts' because it relates his or her interpretations back to the members' mutual understanding of their utterances as manifest in their behaviour'. Auer (1984,p. 6)

Some researchers like Blom and Gumperz (1972) and Myers-Scotton (1993a) are considered to be the macro-level as they link the use of CS with 'the group identities of speakers involved' 15 Other researchers study the function of CS using frameworks based on a micro-level, such as Auer (1984), which is the meaning that they place emphasis on the structure and organization of code-switching in conversation is more important. The CA approach argues that macro interpretations might rely too much on analysts' perceptions and purposes, which is a risk.

Sequential analysis, however, focuses on the local, turn-by-turn interpretation of CS meaning, which is 'brought about' as the conversation is evolving (Li Wei, 1998,p.170). On the other hand, CA has been criticized for the fact that overwhelming emphasis is placed on the sequencing and as a result social messages as well as the identity of the participants is ignored upon interpretation of code-switching (Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai, 2001). Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai (2001,p.4) also criticize CA for neglecting social motivations, viewing CA as quite easy even though they can be used preferably to show the speakers intention.

Though the two aforementioned groups of research still differ theoretically in significant ways, there are some studies trying to incorporate both the micro and the macro aspect; such are Li Wei, Milroy and Ching (1992) and Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai (2001). These efforts are trying to incorporate each other's views in an attempt to provide a coherent model for code-switching. Wei, Milroy and Ching (1992) suggest that for using the adequate amount of code-switching, the social and situational context of CS is important, no matter what perspective the researcher is following. They claim that even though there is ample research in CS and a wealth of data analyses of CS behavior from a variety of communities, a coherent framework seems to be lacking that would be suitable to account for these data and analyses. Li Wei, Milroy and Ching (1992) proposed a two step approach to CS by using the CA framework and the Rational Choice (RC) model in an attempt to combine micro and macro factors. The first step is to use the social network framework to describe participants' linguistic choices in the community level, while as a second step they proceed in a detailed conversational analysis. As they stress, 'any attempt to integrate micro and macro levels of analysis entails a consideration of patterns of language choice1 at the community (or even national) level, conjunction with an analysis of code-switching at the interactional level' (Li Wei, Milroy and Ching, 1992,p.64).

Studies show that Li Wei, Milroy and Ching (1992) add that while Gumperz has not made a micro/macro link in his approach either, even though he just might not have wanted to, those who wish to follow his procedures should endeavor to do so. (Li Wei, Milroy and Ching, 1992).

Apart from these two approaches, there are accounts of the functions of CS, which cannot be assigned to the category of a micro/macro approach.

These approaches have received quite a lot of criticism, among them from Gumperz himself and Auer. Gumperz (1982) points out that the first problem is with the definition of 'function' itself: there are no clear definitions and on top of that, a single label cannot capture all the patterns of a function. Auer (1995,p.120) also points out this problem, adding that 'frequently, we get lists of conversational code alternation and examples, but no sequential analysis is carried out to demonstrate what exactly is meant, for example by 'change of activity type', or by 'reiteration''. Auer (1995) calls for a grounding of categories used and a more in-depth sequential study of the functions, as it would be revealed that one category can contain quite different conversational structures.

The second problem as pointed out by Gumperz (1982) and Auer (1995,p.120) is that these code-alternation often mix 'conversational structures, linguistic forms and functions of code-alternation'. So Auer (1995) gives the example of the function of emphasis, which may be a function of CS, while 'reiteration' is a conversational structure.

Third, according to Auer (1995), such lists or typologies of CS may serve initially just to give a hint about what is happening regarding CS, but we cannot be sure that such a listing will bring us closer to a theory of code-alternation, or reveal anything about why CS might have a 17 conversational meaning or function. Auer (1995) continues that the list is unlikely to become a closed one as speakers use it in a creative manner making its function practically endless even if it were used in a specific environment only for once.

2.2.2. The Functions of Teachers' Code Switching

The teachers' use of code switching is not always conscious; which means that the teacher is not always aware of the functions and outcomes of the code switching process. Therefore, in some cases it may be used in classes as an unconscious behavior. Nevertheless, either conscious or not, it necessarily serves some basic functions which may be beneficial in language learning environments. These functions are listed as topic switch, affective functions, and repetitive functions by Mattson and Burenhult (1999, p.61). In order to have a general idea about these, it will be appropriate to give a brief explanation about each function. In topic switch cases, the teacher alters his/her language according to the topic that is under discussion. This is mostly observed in grammar instruction, that the teacher shifts his language to the mother tongue of his students in dealing with particular grammar points, which are taught at that moment. In these cases, the students' attention is directed to the new knowledge by making use of code switching and accordingly making use of native tongue. At this point it may be suggested that a bridge from known (native language) to unknown (new foreign language content) is constructed in order to transfer the new content and meaning is made clear in this way as it is also suggested by Cole (1998). The teacher uses this as the students' attention getter or to make the rule easier for all of students. In addition to the function of code-switching named as topic switch, the phenomenon also carries affective functions that serve for expression of emotions. In this respect, code-switching is used by the teacher in order to build solidarity and intimate relations with the students. In this sense, one may speak of the contribution of code-switching for creating a supportive language environment in the classroom. As mentioned before, this is not always a conscious process on the part of the teacher. However, one may also infer the same thing for the natural occurrence of code switching as one cannot take into guarantee its conscious application if the Maori example given in section II is considered. Another explanation for the functionality of code-switching in classroom settings is its repetitive function. In this case, the teacher uses code-switching in order to transfer the necessary knowledge for the students for clarity. Following the instruction in target language, the teacher code switches to native language in order to clarify meaning, and in this way stresses importance on the foreign language content for efficient comprehension. However, the tendency to repeat the instruction in native language may lead to some undesired student behaviours. A learner who is sure that the instruction in foreign language will be followed by a native language translation may lose interest in listening to the former instruction which will have negative academic consequences; as the student is exposed to foreign language discourse limitedly.

2.2.3. The Functions of Students' Code Switching

As it is the case for teachers' code switching, the students also are not always aware of the reasons for code switching as

well as its functions and outcomes. Although they may unconsciously perform code switching, it clearly serves some functions either beneficial or not.

Eldridge names these functions as: equivalence, floor-holding, reiteration, and conflict control (1996, p.305-307). The first function of student code switch is equivalence. In this case, the student makes use of the native equivalent of a certain lexical item in target language and therefore code switches to his/her native tongue. This process may be correlated with the deficiency in linguistic competence of target language, which makes the student use the native lexical item when he/she has not the competence for using the target language explanation for a particular lexical item. So 19 "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. The next function to be introduced is floor-holding. During a conversation in the target language, the students fill the stopgap with native language use. It may be suggested that this is a mechanism used by the students in order to avoid gaps in communication, which may result from the lack of fluency in target language. The learners cannot find an appropriate target language structure or lexicon. 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. The third consideration in students' code switching is reiteration of the message. In this case, the message in target language is repeated by the student in native tongue through which the learner tries to give the meaning by making use of a repetition technique. The reason for this specific language alternation case may be two-folds: first, he/she may not have transferred the meaning exactly in target language. Second, the student may think that it is more appropriate to code switch in order to indicate the teacher that the content is clearly understood by him/her. The last function of students' code switching to be introduced here is conflict control. For the potentially conflictive language use of a student (meaning that the student tends to avoid a misunderstanding or tends to utter words indirectly for specific purposes), the code switching is a strategy to transfer the intended meaning. The underlying reasons for the tendency to use this type of code switching may vary according to students' needs, intentions or purposes. 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; therefore possible misunderstandings are avoided.

2.2.4. A Discussion on the Use of Code switching in Language Classrooms

Many teachers, who apply communicative techniques in the language teaching environment, oppose any form of native language use during classroom instruction. But some teachers suggest that it may be an effective strategy in various aspects. Following the ideas of these two parties, some weak and strong sides of the use of code switching in foreign language classroom settings will be mentioned with a critical perspective. Cook (2002, p.333) motioned that code switching in classes which do not share the same native language may create problems, as some of the students will somehow be neglected. So, at this point it may be suggested that the students should share the same native language, if code-switching will be applied in instruction. Another point to consider in this respect is that the competence of the teacher in

mother tongue of students also plays a vital role, if positive contributions of code switching are expected. A further discussion is put forward by Eldridge, as he suggests "the learners have no guarantee that their audience will share knowledge of their mother tongue" (1996,p.309). This perspective concerns the interaction of students with native speakers of the target language, as mutual intelligibility may not be possible if the learner switches his language during communication. In supporting the existence of code-switching in language classrooms, Skiba (1997) suggests that code-switching is mostly used for continuity in speech instead of presenting interference in language. In this respect, code switching stands to be a supporting element in communication of information and in social interaction; therefore serves for communicative purposes in the way that it is used as a tool for transference of meaning. Additionally, the functions of the teacher's code switching stand as supportive explanations for the strong sides of the phenomenon. All these in general lead to the idea that the use of code switching somehow builds a bridge from known to unknown and may be considered as an important element in language teaching when used efficiently.

2.3. Speaking Skill

A brief review of the related review about the speaking skill and its different perspectives would seem necessary to support the claims for the implementation of this study. Before defining speaking skill the researcher wants to get the readers' attentions by asking these two questions, what are the learners' problems in the communication? And why do the most of them have difficulties in this skill?

These are the answers of the questions:

- Limited vocabulary
- Inaccurate grammar
- Lack of fluency
- Imperfect pronunciation
- Lack of active listening
- Fear of speaking in public
- Fear of expressing certain views
- Lack of confidence
- Lack of group skills
- Fear of making mistakes
- Lack of exposure and practice

The importance of art of the speaking is now one of the most crucial matters which is felt necessary for the every single person. Whether one is an executive, an engineer, a doctor, a lawyer, Software professional, a public relations practitioner, a journalist, an accountant or a politician, he cannot be successful without knowing how to speak. Speaking skill is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving and processing information (Brown, 2001,p.26). It is form and meaning are dependent on the context in which it occurs, including the participant themselves, their collective experience, the physical environment, and the purpose for speaking. It is often spontaneous, open-ended, and evolving. However, speech is not always unpredictable. Therefore, in line with this study the "speaking skill" refers to the skill of the students in producing, receiving and processing information orally after they are taught through role play. When students cannot speak they cannot communicate and and they cannot use their knowledge of English. By using role play students experience real life like situations and they can express themselves better in real life situations.

Authors such as Klein (1986) argued that because of the adults tendency to their native identity it prevents them to

achieve to the perfect second language pronunciation. But this is not mean that they cannot reach to the native-like pronunciation. Not only adults are able to use correct grammatical points of second language but also they can use correct phonological rule to improve their speaking skills.

Based on Lazaraton(2001) oral communication can be divided in to four dimension or competencies: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, strategic competence. She stated that for reaching to high level of oral foreign language learners should develop all these abilities. In her category dealing with fluency gets more attention in communicative approach rather than accuracy.

Goodwin (2001) stated that pronunciation is not end in itself but it is a mean for conveying meaning in specific sociocultural and interpersonal contexts. Goodwin (2001) suggested that the focus is on fluency rather than accuracy and emphasis is put on suprasegmentals.

As we can understand that there is a challenge for the teachers when their students speak the same first language and the students do not use English outside of the class (Lazaraton, 2001). She 23also stated that in this class there is some limitation such as lack of motivation and lack of opportunities to use the language. But there are some solutions for this problem. Thombury (2005) suggested that the reason that students complain about speaking is that there is lack of real activities. Solcova (2011) also stated that students need to practice speaking with practical activities and teachers cannot do it in a large scale. There are some factors for having a successful conversation. These are contextual aspects, such as turn-taking and knowledge of adjacency pairs. Sociocultural and pragmatic features have significant effect on communication because there is misunderstanding about these aspects as personal characteristic of speaker rather than his/her linguistic incapacities.

Solcova(2011) stated that teachers ignore to teach to the students how to distribute pauses within utterances. He also stated that learners must receive feedback after communicative activities. From the studies the researcher has done in language learning we can realized that classroom interaction and students' oral participation are necessary in the class. The problem that most teachers have in a foreign language class is to force students respond in a language which is taught. When students are active in class they can achieve to higher academic level than they are passive. Krupa-Kwiatkowski(1998) reminded that interaction in class such as participating in conversation and engagement in the class activity and being active in class leads to better language learning. But some studies indicated that in language learning there is a silent period (Hananian, Gradman, 1977; Krashen, 1982; Rodriguez, 1982). This period is considered to be a natural part of oral language acquisition, in language learning class the most observable part is oral participation of students. Thus the most emphasize is put on the oral production or students interaction in the class (Ellis, 1988, 1993; Ely, 1986; Gomez, 1995; Tsui, 1992; Wagner-Gough & Hatch, 1975)

Swain (1985) explain his output hypothesis which says for reaching the native- speaker levels 24of grammatical accuracy, learners must use of their linguistic resources. Ely (1986) stated that classroom participation influences oral correctness. There is a positive relationship between language learning and the amount of time that used for oral interaction inside and outside of the language class.

Brown and Yule (1983) make a distinction between two language functions. The first is interactional function which is the transform of information and convey of information. The second is interactional function which is the maintenance of social relationships. Interactional and transactional are the functions of spoken language.

Rivers (1987) stated that interaction causes communication.

Dell Hymes (1974) said that communicative competence is an alternative to Chomsky's linguistic competence. Communicative competence includes linguistic competence, sociolinguistic and conversational skills that help speaker to know how to communicate. Savignon (1970s) studied about communication skills on the bases of communicative competence which contain several important characters. She explains the communicative competence as the ability to communicate in a communicative setting.

Participation instruction causes students and teacher explain their expectation and the differences in their class and also directs students toward expected class participation behaviors. When students reach to this mutual understanding in the class they can feel comfortable and confidence in the class (Tsou, 2005).

Making business plan and presentation and doing negotiation are kinds of simulation that are effective in English class. When we want to learn English language we must learn how to speak the language. Ur stated speaking is the most important skills among four skills. Learners of language are interested in learning to speak a new language (Ur, 1996). However many learners think that learning to speak a foreign language is frustrating because speaking involves many factors. When you speak a language fluently it is supposed that you have the knowledge of language features and also have the ability to process information and language 'on the spot' (Harmer, 2001).

Today different methods and techniques and approaches are used to encourage students to speak English. Teachers use different lesson instruction and communicative techniques to motivate the students to speak English. Using target language as a mean to talk about language is a best way for learning language.(Maguire al., 2010). Sarwar et al.(2014) stated that if we want to improve students' spoken language we must included assessment process in teachers' instructional program. This is crucial to know that When teachers want to teach speaking skills and communication strategies first they should know what they want to teach and second which specific speaking features they want to develop in learners and with which they want to develop it.

Razmjoo and Ghasemi Ardekani (2011) recommended that learners' gender and the level of proficiency cannot effect on their speaking strategy use. Hismangola (2000) stated that we can overcome communication difficulties and social strategies which are in conditions that we need to practice our knowledge by using communication strategies.

Haung (2006) claimed that non-native speakers think that speaking a foreign language is demanding and crucial in their everyday life. Tagg (1996) said that language learners are not satisfied with their ability to speak a foreign language. Even highly proficient language learners cannot be satisfied with their speaking skills and they try to find a chance to improve their speaking ability.

Chang (1990) and Chou (2002) found that there is no difference between female and male in the use of language learning process. Bilingual speakers have the ability to code-

switch or mix their languages during communication. While speaking, they use more than one language simultaneously, and switches from one to another very easily. This is the most common phenomenon in the speech of bilingual or multilingual speakers. Sometimes a full sentence can be in one language while the next one is in the other. But code-switching must follow certain grammatical rules and one cannot switch from one language to other at any points in the discourse. Following example will make it clear. Here we will only discuss how this phenomenon is used by bilingual speakers as an effective strategy to achieve certain objectives.

(1) I want a car rouge. (rouge 'red')

(2) I want a rouge car. (rouge 'red')

In these sentences, the English word "red" is replaced with its French equivalent. A noteworthy aspect of sentence (1) above is that the French adjective "rouge" follows a grammatical rule that is observed by most bilingual speakers that code-switch. Thus, according to the specific grammatical rule-governing sentence (1) above, sentence (2) would be incorrect because language switching can occur between an adjective and a noun, only if the adjective is placed according to the rules of the language of the adjective. In this case, the adjective is in French; therefore, the adjective must follow the French grammatical rule that states that the noun must precede the adjective (Roberto R. Heredia, 1997). In a multilingual society, each language uniquely fulfills certain roles and represent distinct identities, and all of them complement one another to serve "the complex communicative demands of a pluralistic society" (Sridhar, 1996, p.53). Traditionally, it is believed that code-switching functions as a strategy to compensate for diminished language proficiency. The belief behind this theory is that bilinguals code-switch because they do not know either language completely. This argument is also known as semi-lingualism (Roberto R. Heredia, 1997). However, one thing should be admitted that the notion of language proficiency is not clearly defined. It is not clear whether reading and writing language skills should be taken into consideration as much as the spoken language. This reliance on reading and writing is problematic because most bilinguals receive their formal education in one language, whereas a majority of their social interactions take place in the other language. So, when their reading and writing abilities are tested in both languages, it is quite expected that the language in which bilinguals received formal education will usually fare better.

If code-switching is functionally motivated, then a study that investigates the functions of code-switching occurring in a particular bilingual or multilingual society will be meaningful. As language of a certain speech community is closely related to the cultural practices of that community and since language and culture influence each other, language behaviours of the speakers are influenced by the cultural aspects. A small change in the cultural aspects will obviously bring corresponding changes in the language to account for those concepts. That is why the purposes, functions of code choices and code-switching varies in different cultures, language communities, or by different social situations. Therefore, this paper aims to illustrate a general overview about the intents of switchers and what is gained by communicating with code-switch.

In addition to Gumperz's work on bilingual discourse strategies, many studies (Poplack, 1980; McClure, 1981; Gumperz, 1982; Bialystok, 1983; Foerch & Kasper, 1983; Tarone, 1983; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Milroy & Muysken,

1995; Romaine, 1995) have revealed that bilingual speakers use CS as a valuable linguistic strategy to achieve certain communicative goals. This illustrates that CS is far from being a language deficit.

2.1. Poplack (1980,p.581) states that 'CS mostly used in bilingual's grammar where the surface structures of L1 and L2 overlap. Poplack (1980,p.596) attributes a variety of functions to her informants' use of CS. She also recognizes (Ibid 608) that other extra linguistic factors such as sex, age of L2 acquisition contribute to the occurrences of CS.

2.2. Gumperz (1982,p.75-80) addresses social functions for the use of CS. He identifies six basic discourse functions that code switching plays in conversation: quotations, addressee specification, interjections, reiteration, message qualification, and personalization versus objectivization. In quotations, code switching occurs to report someone else's utterance as direct quotations. In addressee specification, the switch serves to direct the message to one particular person among several addressees. Interjections serve to mark sentence fillers. Reiterations occur when the speaker repeats the message in the other code. It clarifies what has been said or increases the utterance's perlocutionary effect. Message qualification is the elaboration of the preceding utterance in the other code. Lastly, personification versus objectivization indicates the degree of speaker involvement in what is being said. quotations, addressee specification, interjections, reiteration, and message qualification.

2.3. Bialystok (1983,p.100) discusses the various communication strategies which are used by non-native speakers (NNSs) including language switching (CS), foreign language, and transliteration. She claims that "the best strategy users are those who have adequate formal proficiency in the target language and are able to modify their strategy selection to account for the nature of the specific concept to be conveyed" (Bialystok 1983,p.116).

2.4. Foerch & Kasper (1983) discussed the fact that CS can also be a sign of production difficulties in the target language. Speaking a second language can present problems in speech production which can lead to avoidance or reduction strategies or, alternatively, achievement strategies (1983,p.37). Avoidance strategies include formal reduction strategies, that is, a reduced system (phonological, morphological, syntactic or lexical) in order to avoid producing non-fluent or incorrect utterances, and functional reduction strategies, which may include modal reduction, reduction of propositional content through topic avoidance, message abandonment or meaning replacement (Foerch & Kasper 1983,p.52). With achievement strategies, the speaker tries to expand his communicative resources with the use of compensatory strategies, which include code-switching, interlingual transfer, interlanguage based strategies (generalization, paraphrase, word coinage, restructuring) co-operative strategies and non-linguistic strategies.

2.5. Tarone (1983) raises a discussion on what a communication strategy is. She distinguished between sociolinguistic competence and communication strategies, arguing that communication strategies "are used to compensate for some lack in the linguistic system, and focus on exploring alternate ways of using what one does not know for the transmission of a message, without necessarily considering situational appropriateness" (Tarone 1983,p.64).

He proposes (Tarone 1983,p.65) the following criteria when defining a communication strategy:

- 1) A speaker desires to communicate a meaning X to a listener.
- 2) The speaker believes the linguistic or sociolinguistic structure desired to communicate meaning X is unavailable, or is not shared with the listener.
- 3) The speaker chooses to:
 - a) Avoid – not attempt to communicate meaning X, or
 - b) Attempt alternate means to communicate meaning X. The speaker stops trying alternatives when it seems clear to the speaker that there is shared meaning.

2.6. Myers-Scotton (1993), with her markedness model of CS, states that speakers make choices because they are able to consider the social consequences of these choices. Under this model CS occurs due to one of four motivations: 1) CS as a sequence of unmarked choices; 2) CS itself as the unmarked choice; 3) CS as a marked choice; and 4) CS as an exploratory choice.

2.7. Two comparatively recent publications, Milroy and Muysken (1995) and Auer (1998), both collected editions, present many articles on the intricacies of CS and borrowing, containing structural approaches, sociolinguistic standpoints or then articles that investigate the notions of power and negotiation in bilingual conversation. The participants have the central role in the conversation analysis, as they are seen as social actors, whose actions are subject to the co-participants' logical deductions and subsequent verbal actions (Paraskeva, 2010). According to Schegloff (1968,p.1093), the speech of each participant cannot exist or be analysed on its own as in a conversation there is always a 'give and take' relationship among the participants. What follows from these ideas is that utterances should be analysed within the discourse they appear; therefore a sequential analysis should be used. (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984,p.5; Hutchby & Wooffit, 1998). Auer (e.g. 1984, 1995) was one of the first scholars to propose that CS can be accounted for by using conversation analysis. From an interactional point of view, Auer (1984,p.2) calls for a sequential analysis of CS, whose 'global function' is dependent upon its local function – that is, in the conversational context itself. Therefore, what the researcher should do in order to arrive at an interpretation of CS, is take into account the preceding and following sequences; our purpose is to analyze members' procedures to arrive at local interpretations of language alternation' (p. 3). This should be done in order to avoid 'anecdotal descriptions of selected utterances' (p. 2) or a simple enumeration of the functions, which as discussed earlier, is inadequate.

This study does not intend to be a checklist one. Functions are analysed within their context, aiming to interpret meanings through sequential analysis. Labelling of function is used for the sake of convenience and clarity.

2.4. Code-Switching and Speaking Skill

As the researcher discussed in previous sections the two subjects, code-switching and the speaking, attracts many scholars attention which they still have been working on these crucial matters. Knowing that as EFL teachers we have to investigate our own practices on our students as a way of bridging the gap between theory and practice, the researchers of the present study decided to investigate whether code-switching can lead to the establishment of oral proficiency at early levels or not. Code-switching as a strategy to minimize or emphasize social differences among the interlocutors. One can use code-switching as a tool to indicate the social relationships between the interlocutors. The speakers may code switch either to hide the gap in their rank or position in

the society or to manifest his power and apply it on the other participant. When people interact, they adjust their speech, their vocal patterns and their gestures, to accommodate to others (Giles 1971). It explores the various reasons why individuals emphasize or minimize the social differences between themselves and their interlocutors (those with whom they are communicating) through verbal and non-verbal communication. There are two main accommodation processes. Convergence refers to the strategies through which individuals adapt to each other's communicative behaviors, in order to reduce these social differences.

Meanwhile, Divergence refers to the instances in which individuals accentuate the speech and non-verbal differences between themselves and their interlocutors. In other words, it can be said that by convergence, the speaker levels his rank with the other participant and by divergence; he shows his power or authority over the other participant. For example, in

Bangla-English bilingual context, if two friends are talking in English between them and they get on a public bus, they are most likely to switch to Bangla while offering the bus fare to the conductor. And they will switch their code of communication in order to show equal relationship between them and the participant of different status, age, and familiarity and level their rank with the middleclass Bangla speaking people. This is the case of convergence which they adapt to achieve their communicative objective.

While the nature of code-switching is spontaneous and subconscious, studies have reported that it is actually used as a communicative device depending on the switcher's communicative intents (Tay, 1989; Myers-Scotton, 1995, Adendorff, 1996). Speakers use switching strategies to organize, enhance and enrich their speech in order to achieve their communicative objectives.

The discourse-enhancing functions of code-switching have been much discussed in the literature. For example, speakers may code-switch to express solidarity and affiliation with a particular group (Gal, 1978; Milroy, 1987). In addition, code-switching can also be used to fill a linguistic or conceptual gap of the speaker (Gysel, 1992). It is seen as a communication strategy – it provides continuity in speech to compensate for the inability of expressions. Studies have also shown that speakers code-switch to reiterate or emphasize a point (Gal, 1979). By repeating the same point in another language, the speaker is stressing or adding more point on the topic of discussion. In addition, code-switching is also used for different pragmatic reasons, depending on the communicative intent of the speakers such as a mitigating and aggravating message (Kozioł, 2000), effective production (Azhar & Bahiyah, 1994), distancing strategy (David, 1999) etc. Studies on code-switching have moved from the notion that the switching behavior is a compensation for linguistic deficiency in bilingual speakers (Adendorff, 1996; Scotton, 1995). Code-switching is seen as 'functionally motivated' behavior (Adendorff, 1996, p. 389). Being a multilingual country, this sociolinguistic phenomenon is very common in Malaysian speakers' speech. Studies have shown that it occurs in both formal and informal contexts of communication and has become a normal verbal mode among Malay-English bilinguals (Jacobson, 2004). If code-switching is functionally motivated, a study that investigates the functions of code-switching occurring in Malaysian bilinguals' communication will, therefore, be meaningful toward the understanding of this phenomenon. This paper examines how code-switching is employed in achieving one's communicative intent in Bahasa

Melayu (BM)-English bilingual conversations during organizational training sessions.

Speakers of more than one language (e.g., bilinguals) are known for their ability to code-switch or mix their languages during communication. This phenomenon occurs when bilinguals substitute a word or phrase from one language with a phrase or word from another language. To illustrate, consider the sentence, (1) I want a motorcycle VERDE. In this sentence, the English word "green" is replaced with its Spanish equivalent. A noteworthy aspect of sentence (1) above is that the Spanish adjective "verde" follows a grammatical rule that is observed by most bilingual speakers that code-switch. Thus, according to the specific grammatical rule-governing sentence (1) above, sentence (2) I want a VERDE motorcycle would be incorrect because language switching can occur between an adjective and a noun, only if the adjective is placed according to the rules of the language of the adjective. In this case, the adjective is in Spanish; therefore, the adjective must follow the Spanish grammatical rule that states that the noun must precede the adjective. Traditionally, code-switching has been viewed as a strategy to compensate for diminished language proficiency. The premise behind this theory is that bilinguals code-switch because they do not know either language completely. This argument is also known as semi-lingualism, which underscores the notion that bilinguals "almost" speak both languages correctly. However, one concern with this account is that the notion of language proficiency is not clearly defined. It is not clear whether reading and writing language skills should take precedence over spoken language. This reliance on reading and writing is problematic because most bilinguals receive their formal education in one language, whereas a majority of their social interactions take place in the other language. So, when their reading and writing abilities are tested in both languages, the language in which bilinguals received more formal education will usually fare better. Recent developments in psycholinguistic research has focused on how code-switching is a natural product of the interaction of the bilingual's two languages. Early researchers viewed code-switching as evidence that the bilinguals' two languages were organized in separate and distinct mental dictionaries. For example, a general finding throughout the literature is that bilinguals take longer to read and comprehend sentences containing code-switched words as compared to monolingual sentences. Apparently, this time consuming process is due to a "mental switch mechanism" that determines which of the bilingual's two mental dictionaries are "on" or "off" during the course of language comprehension. This mental switch is responsible for selecting the appropriate mental dictionary to be employed during the comprehension of a sentence. Thus, for a Spanish-English bilingual speaking English, the English linguistic system is turned on, whereas the Spanish linguistic system remains off. However, if during the course of comprehending a sentence, a Spanish code-switched word is encountered, the mental switch must disable the English linguistic system, and enable the Spanish linguistic system.

Other psycholinguistic research is concerned with identifying some of the factors influencing the comprehension of code-switched words. Research shows that bilinguals comprehend code-switched words faster when there is phonological overlap between the two languages. For example, Chinese-English bilinguals take longer to recognize English code-switched words in Chinese sentences, but only if the English words contain initial consonant-consonant (e.g.,

flight) clusters, simply because the Chinese language lacks this phonotactic structure. Other important factors reported to influence the recognition of code-switch words include, context, phonetics, homophonic (e.g., words pronounced the same), and homographic (e.g., words spelled the same), overlap between the two languages.

Another current view suggests that language dominance (i.e., which language is used more frequently) plays an important role in code-switching. For example, Spanish-English bilinguals report more linguistic interference (code-switching) when they communicate in Spanish, their first-language, and little or no code-switching when they communicate in English, their second-language. In other words, these bilinguals code-switch more when they communicate in Spanish than when they use English. Empirical research supports these observations. Psycholinguistic evidence also suggests that bilinguals retrieve English code-switched words faster when they listen to Spanish sentences, whereas they are slower to retrieve Spanish code-switched words as they listen to English sentences. More interestingly, evidence also shows that code-switched words are actually retrieved faster than monolingual words, but only if the code-switched word is in English, and the language of communication is Spanish. These results suggest a reliance on the bilingual's second-language as opposed to their first-language. How are these results explained? The general idea behind this view is that after a certain level of fluency and frequent use of the second-language, a language shift occurs in which the second-language behaves as if it were the bilingual's first-language. In other words, the second-language becomes more readily accessible and bilinguals come to rely on it more. Thus, regardless of which language the bilingual learned first, the more active (dominant) language determines which mental dictionary is going to be accessed faster. This argument is reasonable since most bilinguals in the US, whose first-language is Spanish, obtain their formal education in English. Likewise, many of their everyday interactions involve the second-language. As a result, words and concepts in English, the second-language, become more accessible than words in Spanish, the first-language. Thus, code-switching is not the same for both languages. Rather, it depends on language dominance. During early stages of bilingualism, Spanish-English bilinguals rely on their first-language when they communicate in their second-language. As a result, bilinguals are more likely to code-switch to Spanish, when they communicate in English. However, as the second-language becomes the dominant language, bilinguals rely on the second-language when they communicate in the first-language. In this case, bilinguals code-switch to English when they communicate in Spanish.

In short, code-switching may be indicative of difficulties in retrieval (access) affected by a combination of closely-related factors such as language use (i.e., how often the first-language is used) and word frequency (i.e., how much a particular word is used in the language). Finally, the notion that people code-switch as a strategy in order to be better understood and to enhance the listeners' comprehension is another plausible alternative.

References

Ali, Shamim. (2011). *Improving Access to Second Language Vocabulary and Comprehension Using Bilingual Dictionaries*. Allen, Esther. (2004). *Bomb literature*. 2645 (87).
 Arnfast, J. S., Jørgensen, J. N. (2003). *Code-switching as a communication, learning, and social negotiation strategy in*

first-year learners of Danish. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 23–53.
 Auer, P. (ed.) (1998) *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*.
 Auer, P. (1984) *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
 Auer, P. (1995) *The Pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach*. In L. yguymilroy & P.
 Auer, P. (1999) *From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a Dynamic typology of bilingual speech*. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3(4): 210-231.
 Auer, P. (2002). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. New York, NY: London: Routledge.
 Ashouri, Amir F. and Fotovatnia, Zahra. (2010). *The Effect of Individual Differences on Learners' Code switching Belief in EFL Learning*. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4): 228-236.
 Atkinson, D. (1987). *The Mother Tongue in the Classroom: A Neglected Resource?* *ELT Journal* 41.4: 241-47.
 Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching Monolingual Classes: Using L1 in the Classroom*. Harlow: Long man group Ltd.
 Auerbach, E. (1993). *Reexamining English Only In The Test ESL Classroom*. *TESOL Journal*, 9-23.
 Au-Yeung, J., Howell, P., & Pilgrim, L. (1999). *Phonological words and stuttering on function words*. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 41, 1019-1030.
 Baddeley, A. (1990). *Human memory: Theory and practice*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
 Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words*. London: Routledge.
 Bawcon, Linda. (2002). *Over-using L1 in the Classroom? ELT Forum from Modern English Teacher*, (11).
 Berruto, Gaetano (1990): "Italiano regionale, commutazione di codice e enunciati mistilingui". In: Cortelazzo, A.
 Berend, N./Mattheier, K. J. (eds.), *Sprachinsforschung. Eine Gedenkschrift für Hugo Jedig*. Frankfurt et al.:Lang, 105-121.
 Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). *Social meaning in linguistic structure: code-switching in Norway*. In J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*(pp.407-434). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
 Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
 Bowen, T, J. Marks (1994). *Inside Teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.
 Brooks-Lewis, Kimberly A. (2009). *Adult Learners' Perceptions of the Incorporation of their L1 in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*. *Applied Linguistics* 30(2): 216-235.
 Brown, Douglas H. (1994). *Teaching by Principles. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Prentice Hall. ISBN 0-13-017816-0
 Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. San Francisco: Longman.
 Brown, H. D., (2001). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. 2nd ed. New York: Longman.
 Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1972). *The pronouns of power and solidarity*. In: P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and social context* (pp. 252-282).
 Bowen, T, J. Marks (1994). *Inside Teaching*. Oxford: Heinemann.
 Butzkamm, W. (1998). *Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: The mother tongue as a conversational lubricant*. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1(2), 81–99.

- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second-language teaching: Theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.
- Carreres, Ángeles (2006). Strange Bedfellows: *Code switching and Language Teaching. The Teaching of Code switching into L2 in Modern Languages Degrees*. 1- 21.
- Carter, R. A. & M. J. McCarthy. (1988). *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. London: Longman
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne. (1991). *Language Teaching Approaches: An Overview*. In Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Chambers, J. (1995). *Sociolinguistic theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chamot, A.U., J.M. O'Malley, L. Kupper and M.V. Impink-Hernandez. (1987). *A Study of Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Instruction: First Year*.
- Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). *Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. Foreign Language Annals, 22(10), 13-24*.
- Chellappan, K. (1991). *The role of code switching in learning English as a second language*. International Journal of Translation, 3, 61-72.
- Cheng, T. Y. (1993). *The syntactical problems Urdu college students meet in reading English technical textbooks*. Indiana: ERIC Document Reproduction.
- Chern, C. L. (1993). *Urdu students' word-solving strategies in reading in English*. In T. Huckin & M. Haynes & J. Coady (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary learning* (pp. 67-81). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Chesterman, A. (1998) *Communication strategies, learning strategies and code switching strategies*. In Malmkjær, K. (ed.) *Code switching and Language Teaching: Language Teaching and Translation*. Manchester. St. Jerome Publishing. 135-44.
- Clyne, Michael (1967): *Transference and Triggering*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Clyne, Michael G. (1991): *Community Languages: The Australian Experience*. Cambridge et al: CUP.
- Clyne, Michael (1994): "What can we learn from Sprachinseln?: Some observations on 'Australian German'". In: Berend, N./Mattheier, K. J. (eds.), *Sprachinselnforschung. Eine Gedenkschrift für Hugo Jedig*. Frankfurt et al. Lang, 105-121.
- Clyne, Michael (2003): *Dynamics of Language Contact. English and Immigrant Languages*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Cole, S .1998. *The Use of L1 in Communicative English Classrooms*. The Language Teacher, 22:11-13
- Cook, V. (1991). *Second Language Learning and Teaching*. London: Arnold.
- Cook, V. J. (1992). *Evidence for multicompetence. Language Learning, 42(4), 557-591*.
- Cook, V. (1993). *Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. London: Macmillan.
- Cook, V. J. (1999). *Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 33(2), 185-20*
- Cook, V. (2001) *Using the first language in the classroom*. In The Canadian Modern Language Review. 57/3. 402-23.
- Cook, V. 2002. *Portraits of the L2 user*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Corder, S. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dell, Gary S. (1986): "A spreading-activation theory of retrieval in sentence production". In: *Psychological Review* 93, 283-321.
- Deller, S., Rinvoluceri, M. (2002). *Using the Mother Tongue. Making the Most of the Learner's Language*. Peaslake. Delta Publishing (with English Teaching Professional: Professional Perspectives).
- Di Sciullo, A. M., Muysken, P., & Singh, R. (1986). Government and codemixing. *Journal of Linguistics, 22*, 1-24.
- Duff, A. (1989) *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duff, P. , Polio, C. (1990). *How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom?* Modern Language Journal, (74), 154-166.
- Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1973). *Should we teach children syntax? Language Learning, 23, 245-258*.
- Eadie, J. (1999). "A Code switching Technique". *ELT Forum 37/1, 2-9*. Eldridge, J. 1996. *Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school*. *ELT Journal, 50(4), 303-311*.
- Eldridge, J. 1996. *Code-Switching in a Turkish Secondary School*. *ELT Journal 50 (4) 303-311*.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review*.
- González-Davies, M. (2002). Humanising Code switching Activities: Tackling a Secret Practice. In *Humanising Language Teaching*. (4).
- Fick, George Christian. (1813). *English dialogues upon the most common subjects of life, with an English-German vocabulary, for schools and private use*.
- Flyman, A. (1997). *Communication strategies in French as a foreign language. Working Papers 46, 57-75*. Department of Linguistics, Lund University.
- Flyman-Mattsson, A., & Burenhult-Mattsson, N. (1999). *Code-switching in second language teaching of French. Working Papers 47, 59-72*. Department of Linguistics, Lund University.
- Gafaranga, J. (2007b) *Code-switching as a conversational strategy*. In P.Auer & Li Wei (eds.)
- González-Davies, M. (2007). *A natural activity in an increasingly bilingual world. In Humanising Language Teaching. (9/2)*.
- González-Davies, M., Scott-Tennent, C. (2009). *Back to mother tongue. L1 and code switching as aids to FLA in a CLIL context*.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1971). *Language in Social Groups*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hancock, M. 1997. *Behind classroom code-switching. Layering and language choice in L2 learner interaction. TESOL Quarterly 31 (2): 217-235*.
- Harley, B., Cummins, J., Swain, M., Allen, P. (1990). *The nature of language proficiency*. Cambridge University Press. (7-25).
- Harmer, J. (1991) *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hewitt, R. (1986). *White talk, black talk*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ife, A. (2007). *A role for English as lingua franca in the foreign language classroom*. In A. Soler & S. Jordà (Eds), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 79-100). Netherland: Springer.

- Holliday, A. (1994). *The house of TESEP and the communicative approach: the special needs of state English language education*. *ELT Journal*, (48/), (3-10).
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1979). On communicative competence. In K. Johnson & C. Brumfit (Eds.), *The Communicative* Husain, K. 1994 'Code switching in the ESL Classroom: Emerging Trends', *International Journal of Code switching*(1.2). (115-30).
- Johnson, D.M. (1992). *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning*, New York: Longman.
- Kavaliauskienė, Galina and Ligija Kaminskienė (2007). *Code switching as a learning tool in English for specific purposes*. *Kalbotyra* 57(3): 132-139.
- Kern, R. (1994). *The Role of Mental Code switching in Second Language Reading*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16: 441-
- Kobayashi, H., and C. Rinnert. (1992). 'Effects of First Language on Second Language Writing: Code switching versus Direct Composition', *Language Learning* 42.2: 183-215
- Leonardi, V. (2010). *The Role of Pedagogical Code switching in Second Language Acquisition*. Bern. Peter Lang Publishing
- Levenston, E. A. (1985). *The place of code switching in the foreign language classroom*. *English Teacher's Journal*, 32, 33-43.
- Liao, P. S. (2002). *Taiwanese Students' Beliefs about Code switching and their Use of Code switching as a Strategy to Learn English*.
- Liao, P. S. (2006). *EFL learners' beliefs about and strategy use of code switching in English learning*. *RELC*, 37(2), 191-215.
- Lin, C. C. (2008). *Lectures*. Tamkang University.
- Li Wei (1994) *Three Generations, Two Languages, One Family: Language Choice and Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Li Wei (2001) *Lemma congruence checking between languages as an organizing principle in intrasentential codeswitching*. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 5: 153-174.
- Li Wei, Milroy L., & Ching (1992) *A Two-step sociolinguistic analysis of code-switching and language choice*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 2(1): 63-86.
- Li Wei (1995) *Conversational code-switching in a Chinese community in Britain: A sequential analysis*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23: 281-299.
- Li Wei (1998). *The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational codeswitching*. Malmkjær, K. (1998). *Code switching & Language Teaching: Language Teaching & Translation*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Martin-Jones, M. (1995). Code-switching in the classroom: Two decades of research. In L. Milroy & P. Muyskens (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 90- 111). Cambridge: Cambridge University
- Martin-Jones, M. 1995. *Code switching in the classroom: two decades of research*. In: Milroy, L. & P. Muysken (Eds.) *One speaker, two languages, cross disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 90-111.
- Myers-Scotton, C. & Jake, J. L. 2001. *Explaining Aspects of Code-Switching and Their Implications*. In: Janet Nichol (Ed.) *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing*. Oxford: Blackwell, 84-116.
- Merritt, M., Cleghorn, A., Abagi, J. O., & Bunyi. G. (1992). *Socializing multilingualism: Determinants of code-switching in Kenyan primary classrooms*. In C. M. Eastman (Ed.), *Code-switching* (pp.103-21).
- Milroy, L. (1987) *Observing and analyzing natural language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (1995) *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary* Mioni, M.A. (eds.) *L'italiano regionale. Atti del XVIII Congresso internazionale di Studi della Società di linguistica italiana*. Roma: Bulzoni, 369-387.
- Muysken (eds.) *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 115-135.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-switching* New York: Oxford University Press, (1993)
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1983). *The negotiation of identities in conversation : A theory of markedness and code choice*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 44: 115-136.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1988). *Self-enhancing codeswitching as interactional power*. *Language and Communication*, 8(3): 199 – 211.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1989). *Code-switching with English: Types of switching, types communities*. *World Englishes*, 8(1), 333-346.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993) *Social motivations for code-switching, evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.