The Effect of Language Choice in a Training Session for Novice Teachers

Ryoko Saigusa
Interlanguage Service System Inc.

JALT 2004 NARA
Language Learning for Life

The effect of code-switching was observed in a training session for novice part-time instructors at a children's English school. The dominating language was English during the five-day training session. However, the trainer as well as the two trainees occasionally switched to Japanese. All discourse where the language changed from L1 to L2 or vice versa were transcribed and studied to see if any patterns existed. As a result, this study suggests two sociolinguistic hypotheses regarding the linguistic functions of code switching: The see-saw hypothesis and the front-stage back-stage hypothesis. The first hypothesis suggests that the two languages were measured on an imaginary scale and the one that can attract more attention was selected. The latter one suggests how the choice of language is determined by the social context of a "formal" situation versus an informal one.

　本稿は、5日間の児童英語新人講師研修において邦人トレーナーが英語で研修を行ったが、参加者全員が途中で母語である日本語に変換したり、英語に戻したりという行動が観察された。言語変換された発話は全て書き起こされ、言語変換自体にまつわるいくつかの社会言語的な機能が分析された。本稿では言語変換について二つの仮説を提唱る。一つ目は「シーソー仮説」。想像上の天秤に両言語をかけてより目立つ方を選択したというものであり、二つ目は「本番―舞台裏仮説」である。特有のコンテキストにおいて、「正式な状況」と「非常」の状況によって言語選択が左右されたというものである。

When the nationalities of the trainer and the trainees are homogeneous in a teacher training session, communicating in our first language may be preferable. However, two novice part-time instructors in a private children's English school preferred their training sessions to be conducted mainly in English (L2). By switching the language from the first to the second, the training session created an opportunity for content-based instruction. Besides the popular immersion programs, Met (cited in Hadley, 2001) adds that content-based foreign language learning can take the form of "augmenting or supplementing instructions in the native language" (p.165). I was curious as to whether all participants including myself as the trainer felt comfortable communicating only in the second language because we were evidently aware that both languages were available and it seemed only natural that we tend to select one language over another in certain situations to facilitate transactional discourse (Morley, 1995) or to ease performance anxiety which tend to prevail during trainees' demonstration lessons. This study describes and analyzes the discourse patterns when the participants switched their language from the target language (L2) to the mother tongue (L1) and vice versa.

Code Switching

According to Richards & Schmidt (2002) *code switching* is defined as an act of changing languages from one language to another in the middle of a speech segment and "…code switching can be a sign of cultural solidarity or distance or serve as an act of identity" (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p.81). It is said that code switching can be an effective teaching strategy (Cook, 1996) or interference (Tarone, 1988) depending on how it is used. Skiba (1997) concludes that "when code switching is to compensate for a language difficulty it may be viewed as interference and when it is used as a socio-linguistic tool it should not" (p.4). In this study, code switching is distinguished from *language transfer* (Gass & Selinker, 1994) where the interlocutor shows signs of interlanguage errors which are considered as a form of avoidance.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, Grosjean (1982) states that one of the social reasons for bilinguals to code-switch comes from the psychological desire of the interlocutor to "[m]ark and emphasize group identity (solidarity)" (p.152). Beebe & Guiles (Beebe, 1988) seem to agree that when people interact with each other, they either emphasize social *convergence* by making their speeches similar to one another or in contrast, separate themselves from the group by emphasizing *divergence*. One form of divergence can be observed when code switching is used to express social power (Grosjean, 1982). Code-switching "raises status, adds authority, shows expertise" and it can "amplify or emphasize" (Grosjean, 1982, p.152) one's message. In some evidence found in Africa, Myers-Scotton (1995) explained that code-switching was used as an effective tool to "boast multiple identities" (p.106).

Nishimura (1995) analyzed discourse delivered by Canadian *Niseis* (second generation Japanese) and suggested a functional perspective of code-switching as a "reach-out strategy" (p.166). When a *Nisei* person tried to communicate with both a native-Japanese and an English dominant *Niseis*, the *Niseis* code-switched right after the end of a sentence that translated what has already been mentioned. Nishimura (1995) named this type of discourse as, "Portmanteau sentences" (p.166) which represents a speech style that repeats what has been said in one language in the alternative language because it attempts to communicate with two different types of listeners at the same time. In another case, Nishimura (1995) found that the act of code-switching functioned as a marker which clearly drew a line between "serious talk" (p.170) and "ordinary casual talk" (p.170).

Models Used to Analyze Code-Switching Discourse

In this study, three different kinds of models are adopted to analyze the data. First, Nishimura's (1995) analysis in studying the functions of *portmanteau sentences* and *serious talk* versus *casual talk* is replicated.

The second model originates from systemic functional linguistics (SFL). Among the three metafunctions of interpersonal, ideational and textual, the interpersonal metafunction was expanded and developed to analyze evaluative language. Under the subsidiary of interpersonal lies *appraisal analysis* (Martin, 1997) which focuses on investigating evaluative language. In this study, the framework of *JUDGEMENT* (Martin, 1997) is used to analyze the trainer's discourse when she gave assessment or evaluation to the trainees.

The third model adopted in this study is Fanselow's (1986) *Foci for observing communication used in setting (FOCUS)* which is suitable in analyzing classroom interaction. As shown in Table 1, the observation system includes five categories of source & target, move, medium, use, and content. In this study, FOCUS is used to observe the interaction between the trainer and the trainees during the demonstration lesson to analyze procedural discourse.

Table 1. Observations using FOCUS

Source &Target	Move	Medium	Use	Content
Who is saying what to whom?	What is being done in the classroom?	What device is used to communicate?	How is it being communicated?	What is the topic?
1. teacher 2. student 3. class 4. others	1. structure 2. solicit 3. respond 4. react	1. linguistic 2. nonlinguistic 3. paralinguistic 4. silence aural/visual	1. attend 2. characterize 3. reproduce 4. relate 5. present	1. life 2. procedure 3. study

Methods

Participants

The participants were two female novice teachers and one female teacher trainer. All three participants were Japanese adults. The first participant (S1) was an office staff member at the school. The second participant (S2) was a parent of one of the registered pupils. I was the trainer (T1) as well as the chief instructor of the young learners division. S1 and S2 attended the training session to learn how to teach kindergarten level classes (ages 4 to 6) and younger primary school classes (ages 7 to 10).

Procedures

Each class was held for 150 minutes for a total of five sessions, which amounted to 12 hours and 30 minutes. All sessions were video and audio-recorded. All code switched discourses (CS) uttered by all three participants were transcribed. Then, the CS sentences were counted and sorted out into two main groups: 1) a group of discourse that was switched from L2 to L1; 2) a group of discourse that was switched from L1 to L2. Second, within the two main groups, sociolinguistic functions were analyzed using the three models described above. Table 2 shows an overview of how the transcribed data were studied. According to Nishimura (1995), no single model can be adopted to analyze CS because CS is "multifunctional" (p.162). Thus, I adopted the framework that best fit the sociolinguistic function of each CS discourse respectively.

Table 2. Linguistic functions and framework of analysis

Two Groups of CS	Linguistic functions	Adopted model of analysis
From English to Japanese (L2 to L1)	Portmanteau sentences talk	Analytical framework (Nishimura, 1995)
	Formal talk and casual talk	Analytical framework (Nishimura, 1995)
	Coaching / procedural talk	FOCUS (Fanselow, 1986)
From Japanese to English (L1 to L2)	Evaluating and assessing talk	Appraisal analysis (Martin, 1997)

Analysis

Quantitatively speaking, among all types of CS discourse delivered by the trainer within the five sessions, there were 31 turns switching from the dominant language of L2 to L1. Among the 31 turns, there were only seven turns which switched back to L1 otherwise the discourse remained in L1 until turn taking took place. Next, one of the trainees (S2) who is highly competent in communicating in L2, showed only two turns of CS from L2 to L1. There were no cases of moving back to L2 because she quickly ended her talk right after CS as if she felt ashamed of it. Finally, the other trainee (S1) delivered seven turns of CS from L2 to L1. There were no cases of switching back to L2 but comfortably elaborated in L1 until she finished explaining her point.

CS of the Trainer from L2 to L1 in Portmanteau Sentences

Nishimura (1995) explains that portmanteau is used to talk to various types of speakers at once. In this study, the trainer used portmanteau sentences to satisfy the trainees' preference to be trained in English while hoping that both trainees would understand the message accurately. Two examples of portmanteau sentences were found from the trainer's discourse. In both cases, CS was conducted from L2 to L1. The trainer was answering a question, giving detailed demonstration of how the trainer herself teaches in her classes. The two examples shown in Table 3 are extracts from a discourse which was in the middle of answering the trainee's question and proceeded on to the actual explanation of the procedure. The abbreviation of *CS* indicates exactly where the language shift had occurred. The English translation to the Japanese discourse samples are given in brackets. The underlined speech segment in bold indicates where the utterance was repeated in both languages. What is different from Nishimura's (1995) study was that in the first example of Table 3, a direct translation was not given but the two utterances of *tatoebane* and *all you have to do* showed a pragmatic similarity. The Japanese *tatoebane* literally means *for example.* The English utterance of *all you have to do is* pragmatically identifies with the Japanese utterance of *tatoebane* since both expressions function to elicit the same action of showing a specific demonstration.

In Example Two of Table 3, portmanteau is uttered both on a lexical level and a sentence level. The words of *voiceless 'th'* and *'f' sound* were translated in Japanese as *foo* ['f' sound] and the actual pronunciation of the voiceless *th*. In

addition, an advice (metalinguistic talk) was first given in the target language, then, the same advice was rephrased in L1 accompanied by physical demonstration, uttering the instructional discourse to show an example. The L2 discourse was rephrased in L1 to emphasize or amplify the message.

Table 3. Samples of CS occurring in portmanteau sentences delivered by the trainer

Example One:

• A case when the trainer was answering a question on how to teach phonics

Trainer: …so the students should be able to read the consonants. So all you have to do is (CS) 例えばねえじゃcat catの骨を取っちゃうとcat C.A.T.母音は骨だって教えておいてktって言ってktこれだとちょっと聞こえないsoこの骨を入れることによって ｃａｔはい、つなげてcat catっていうふうにやってるんです。(CS) Okay, in that case it's very easy for them to…

[For example, if you take out the bone (metaphorical expression for vowels) cat, you know CAT, you tell them that the vowel is the bone and have them pronounce "kt" "kt", see that's inaudible so by placing the bone back in you can have them say "k a t" link it together and go "cat". That's how I do this part]

Example Two:

• A case when the trainer gave feedback to the trainee and proceeded on to actually showing how to teach that particular section.

Trainer: Voiceless "th" the students tend to replace it with the "f" sound uh (CS)「フーは、音はちょっと違うよ〜」って「歯と歯の間にベロをちょっとだけ出して空気をthってそういう音なの。"thirsty"ちょっとやってみて」って感じであんまりくどくやらないんですけれども (CS) maybe you could mention that to the children.

[you say to them, "f" (the Japaneseふ sound) is not the same. You stick out your tongue a little, let out the air and say 'th' Okay, now try thirsty" or something. I tend not to over-teach it though]

CS of the Trainee from L2 to L1 in Formal Talk and Casual Talk

One example was found when one of the trainees, S2, failed to use the CD player promptly during her demonstration lesson. She could not play the CD at the right timing during choral repetition practice and it happened three times. She began to appear nervous and irritated. Until this experience, S2 never employed her mother tongue throughout the training and this incident happened in the fourth session. However, as shown in Table 4, S2 suddenly interrupted the trainer and spoke in L1 to fix up the situation and ease her tension. The trainer also changed the topic, avoided using the CD player, began a lecture on teaching listening, and took the floor for a while to cool things down.

Until S2 became emotionally frustrated in this situation, no case of CS was ever found in her discourse. When she blurted out in Japanese the question of *CD wo tsukawanakutemo iikanji?* [you mean I don't have to use the CD player?], she was speaking from an informal situation

as if she shouted, "time out!" during a game. The social context of being placed in a tight spot made her to switch the language to L1. Otherwise, she sustained her utterance in the second language in formal situations as if she believed that it was the "proper" way to talk during the training.

Table 4. A sample of CS occurring when the trainee's tension became high

• A case right after the trainer stopped S2's demonstration because she was struggling with the CD player. First, the trainer began to show a demonstration herself in English.

Trainer: (trainer demonstrates in English) (CS)ってくどくくどくやると[like that you do it many times]

"Yes, it is" "No, it isn't" でno [then when it's no…]

(trainee interrupts)

Trainee (S2): (CS) CDは使わなくてもいい感じ? [I don't have to use the CD?]

Trainer: うん、でこれをやってからCDを使うとみんな何が行われるのかがわかります。[Yeah, well if you play the CD after you do this exercise, then, everyone is going to understand what you're trying to do]

CS of the Trainer from L2 to L1 as a Coaching Device

During one of the demonstration lessons, when the trainer and the other trainee both pretended to be a seven-year old pupil, CS to L1 occurred frequently. The interactive conversation was transcribed and analyzed by applying it to the observation system of FOCUS (Fanselow, 1986) which best describes teacher-student dynamics as well as the function of each discourse. Table 5 shows the first case

when one of the trainees (S2) forgot to teach the penmanship of the letter *A*. The analysis shows that while the trainer was playing the role of a seven-year old, she implicitly aimed to guide S2 into doing the penmanship. Under the category of *use* (Fanselow, 1986), which describes how the discourse was used to communicate the content, it is shown that the trainer *characterized* (an act of indicating whether something is right or wrong) at the end because S2 could not understand the fact that she forgot to teach penmanship. This means that though the trainer was disguised as a pupil, she was the one teaching what to do next. Table 5 shows this case. The items in bold shows the discourse of the trainer and its linguistic function.

The second example analyzed by FOCUS (Fanselow, 1986), shows a case where S1 demonstrates a phonics lesson to teach the voiceless th. This was the second time for S1 to teach this section. Previously, S1 was advised to check whether the pupils are replacing the voiceless th with a F sound or a Japanese ふ (fu) when pronouncing the word thirsty. S1 failed to realize the child's mistake before. However, Table 6 clearly shows that S1 taught the pseudo-pupil (trainer) to change her pronunciation to a voiceless th instead of a Japanese fu (refer to the bolded section). The trainer purposely made a Japanese fu sound by saying, "foosty" (for thirsty) while S1 corrected her mistake. When applying this action to FOCUS, this was labeled as characterizing. This function of characterizing was conducted consecutively three times by S1 until the pseudo-pupil articulated the correct phonetic sound. Each time S1 characterized, the trainer spoke in L1 disguised as a child. The process is shown in bold.

Table 5. A case of L1 being used as a coaching device

	Target Discourse	Source & Target	Move	Medium	Use	Content
S2	Write the alphabet	teacher/student	structure	linguistic/aural paralinguistic	present	procedure
T1	**(CS)Alphabetってな〜に？ [What's an alphabet?]**	student/teacher	solicit	linguistic/aural	present	study
S2	"A". CD says something.	teacher/student	respond	linguistic/aural paralinguistic	set	procedure
	It's difficult so let's do it together.	teacher/class	Structure	Linguistic/aural paralinguistic	set	procedure
	Where's the ruler? Here? Here? Where's the ruler?	teacher/class	solicit	Linguistic/aural paralinguistic	present	study
	Kuni come here and point.	teacher/student	solicit	Linguistic/aural paralinguistic	set	procedure
T1	**(CS)どうやって書けばいいのかわかんない。[I don't know how to write this]**	student/teacher	respond	linguistic/aural paralinguistic	relate	**procedure**
S2	Write "A" in your book.	teacher/student	React & solicit	linguistic/oral	present	procedure
T1	**(CS)ううん、そうじゃなくてAの書き順。** [No, I mean the way to write the letter "A"]	student/teacher	respond	linguistic/aural paralinguistic	**characterize**	**procedure**

Table 6. Second case of L1 used as a coaching device

	Target Discourse	Source & Target	Move	Medium	Use	Content
T1	ジュース飲んでる *[you're drinking juice]*	student/teacher	respond	linguistic/aural	relate	study
S2	飲みたい[I want to drink it]	student/teacher	respond	linguistic/aural	present	life
T1	<u>うーんと、フースティー</u> [umm, *"thirsty"]* with an initiative sound of 'f'	student/teacher	respond	linguistic/aural	relate	study
S1	Thirsty	teacher/student	solicit	linguistic/aural paralinguistic		study
T1	<u>それそれ!フースティー</u> *[yes, that's it! foosty"]*	student/teacher	respond	linguistic/aural	reproduce	study
S1	ううん、thirsty, thirsty　ベロはさんでthirsty*[No, no, 'thirsty, thirsty' you stick your tongue out a little and say, 'thirsty']*	teacher/student	react& solicit	linguistic/aural paralinguistic		study
T1	あ〜、*[oh]* **thirsty**	student/teacher	respond	linguistic/aural	reproduce	study
S1	good	teacher/student	react	linguistic/aural		study

CS of the Trainer from L1 to L2 in Evaluative Discourse

Needless to say, since the training session was conducted as a content-based instruction, English (L2) was the dominant language. Therefore, after each demonstration lesson, the trainee was asked to give a comment in L2. However, *L1 transfer* in the form of *avoidance* (Ellis, 1997, p.51) was observed as well. For example, S1 clearly stated, "I want to speak in Japanese because I can not explain very well in English" and therefore gave her comments in L1. In such circumstances, the trainer conceded and reacted in L1 as well. Nevertheless, the language was switched back to L2 again when the trainer proceeded with the evaluation. Two similar cases were observed. The two examples are analyzed by applying it to the appraisal analysis framework of *JUDGEMENT* (Martin, 2001) shown in Table 7 to confirm what exactly was being evaluated.

Table 7. An analysis of evaluative discourse

Case One:

A case when the trainer was giving feedback to S1 after S1 gave her comments on her demonstration lesson.

Trainer:

そう、このクラスはねあのロールプレイが好きなんですね。非常に歌とロールプレイが好きな女の子たちのクラスで、そう、そうですか?(1)うまくいったね、すごくね *[Yes, this class loves role-plays. It's a class of girls who like singing and role-playing very much. Well, it sounds like (1)the class went well, really well]*(**CS**) That's very nice okay. (2)I think that was a very effective way to use the wall chart and the introduction part of the "Conversation Time" yeah and also…

• Target sentence(1): capacity

The trainer explicitly expressed her opinion of what she thinks about the trainee's lesson. Something being a success or not is a judgment of capacity.

• Target sentence(2): capacity

The trainer gave an assessment regarding how S1 used the wall chart. The evaluative lexis of "effective" indicates that the trainer praised S1's way of using the wall chart innovatively.

Case Two:

A case when the trainer was giving feedback right after S1 finished her demonstration lesson

(1) 相当慣れたね。もうスムーズで *[you really seem like you're* (1) *getting used to this, smooth and everything]***(CS)** (2)The entire flow was very smooth and so as a student I was able to …

• Appraisal analysis(1): capacity

The trainer expressed her assessment regarding S1's performance of the demonstration lesson. A person "getting used to" something is an ability of adaptability.

• Appraisal analysis(2): capacity

The trainer expressed her assessment regarding S1's performance of the demonstration lesson again in English. She praised S1 being prompt in each procedure by using the word, "smooth". Having smoothness in a flow of a procedure requires the ability to learn quickly and put it into action.

Discussion

The See-saw Hypothesis

The choice made by the trainer to depend on L1 when explaining the procedure or coaching is an example of CS as linguistically functioning to appeal its identity and to highlight the message. It can also be critically interpreted that the decision to choose L1 during procedural discourse implies an intention to have the trainees comprehend the message with precision. In such kind of transactional discourse (Morley, 1995), L1 and L2 are spontaneously placed on the speaker's imaginary scale and the one that is *not* spoken at the moment may have been instantaneously employed for the purpose of using the other optional language as a marker. In other words, the two languages

were measured on a see-saw and the one that can attract more attention was selected.

Nishimura's (1995) theory of portmanteau sentences was applied to the discourse of the trainer. The reason for the bilingual trainer to semantically or pragmatically repeat one message in another language came from an intention to accurately convey her message. This need of accuracy was placed on the imaginary see-saw for the purpose to perform in ultimate degree of success which naturally led the trainer to switch to L1.

The Back-stage Front-stage Hypothesis

In this study, all participants used both languages. As suggested by Beebe & Giles (Beebe, 1988)*,* the participants switched languages to emphasize social cohesiveness (convergence) or social distinctiveness (divergence) depending on the situation. For example, the trainer insisted on using L2 to distance herself when evaluating or assessing the trainees while she tried to reach solidarity in L1 when empathizing with the trainee's negative emotions. This behavior seems to reflect how the trainer manipulated her social power. In this context, the trainer having the right to deliver guidance and assessment was assisted through the use of L2. Since L2 helped her gain the distance she needed to convey her power, she felt more confident in delivering her subjective opinions. All evaluative discourse that was analyzed under the category of *capacity* in appraisal analysis explained that the subjective comments of the trainer were strictly focused on the trainee's teaching ability and nothing else.

Contemplating social divergence and power, it can be interpreted as distance between the trainer and the trainees, the discourse may have been construed as a more *formal* kind of discourse such as a lecture. This formality can be metaphorically depicted as the *front-stage* where the participants were acting out their roles on stage. For one of the trainees (S2) who became frustrated with the CD player, the image of formality seemed to have linked with a feeling of success. For S2, being successful meant sustainability to communicate in English all the time. However, when she faced emotional pressure, she reluctantly switched to Japanese which can be interpreted as a sign of giving up. The act of giving up stands in contrast to success, thus, the choice of speaking in L1 represented casual talk or *back stage talk* of S2. Not only the trainee herself but the trainer who always gave her opinions in L2 adapted to the frustrating situation and selected to speak in L1. When something unexpected happened on stage, the problem was solved behind the curtain.

Lastly, the observation system of FOCUS described how L1 had the potentiality to control the situation without being too invasive. Similar to a *kuroko* (a stagehand dressed in black) in a kabuki performance, the effect of L1 was almost invisible on the surface. During the demonstration lesson, none of us were aware of which language we were speaking but were more absorbed in our roles to act as a child. However, by re-observing the scene on the video, and analyzing it through the FOCUS system, I detected a dual effect of CS in regard to its linguistic function. Overtly, it was a natural choice for the trainer to speak in L1 when role-playing a seven-year old in an EFL setting. L1 functioned as part of the costume so to speak. The other hidden effect was that the verbal disguise of a child paved the way to openly express what was missing in the lesson (i.e. to teach the penmanship). The remarks delivered by a child-like talk turned out to be a camouflage to deliver a warning that could actually be harsh if it was bluntly said, "you forgot to teach the penmanship". The L1 child talk transformed the message into a much milder tone. The noticeable point here is that if the disguised child delivered the same remarks of, "I don't know how to write this" and, "No, I mean the way to write the letter A" in L2, the effect would have been different because it is unnatural for a Japanese child learning English in an EFL setting to speak so well. Then, the face of the trainee could be threatened by too overt an expression of potential criticism.

Conclusion

The goal of this study hoped to examine whether past theories of CS can be applied to a teacher training context in an EFL setting. As a result, not only did I find many similarities with previous studies but feel encouraged to modestly suggest future research to analyze CS as a powerful pragmatic device, potentially a new genre of *teacher talk* in an EFL setting.

References

Beebe, L.M. (1988). Five sociolinguistic approaches to second language acquisition. In L.M. Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in second language acquisition: Multiple perspectives.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Cook, V. (1996). *Second language learning and language teaching (2nd edition).* London: Arnold.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fanselow, J. (1987). *Breaking Rules: Generating and exploring alternatives in language learning.* New York: Longman.

Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Hadley, A.O. (2001). *Teaching language in context third edition.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Lightbown, P.M. & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned (Revised Edition).* New York: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J.R. (1997a). Analysing genre: Functional parameters. In F. Christie & J.R.Martin (Eds.), *Genre and institutions: Social processes in the workplace and school.* (pp. 3-39). London: Cassell.

Martin, J.R. (2001). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 142-175). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Morley, J. (1995). Academic listening comprehension instruction: Models, principles, and practices. In D.J. Mendelsohn & J. Rubin (Eds.). *A guide for the teaching of second language listening* (pp. 167-186). San Diego: Dominie Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1995). *Social motivation for code switching: Evidence from Africa.* Oxford: Claredon.

Nishimura, M. (1995). A functional analysis of Japanese/English code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics, 23*, 157-181.

Richards, J.C. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics (3rd edition).* London: Pearson Education.

Skiba, R. (1997, October). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The Internet TESL Journal 3*(10). [Online] Available <iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-CodeSwitching.html>

Tarone, E. (1988). *Variation in interlanguage*. Edward Arnold.

JALT 2004 NARA — Language Learning for Life