

Codeswitching in EFL Learner Discourse

Ethel Ogane

Tokyo YMCA

L1 use by L2 learners has been couched in negative terms like "resort to" and "fall back on." However, L1 use can be looked at in a more positive way. The alternative use of the learners L1 and their approximation of the TL may be termed codeswitching (CS). This study looks at CS in five female Japanese EFL learners. Analysis of spoken data and insights from subjects' verbal reports suggest that CS is discourse related. CS helps learners manage and smooth the flow of conversation, and allows them to express their dual identities of student and individual in the classroom.

第二言語学習者による第一言語の使用は「第一言語に頼る」という表現にも見られるように否定的に捉えられてきた。しかしながら第一言語の使用はもっと肯定的に捉えることも可能である。第一言語と目標言語の近似値である中間言語との交替はコード切り替えと考えることもできる。本研究は、5人の日本人女性英語学習者によるコード切り替えを検討した。被験者の会話データと内省報告を分析したところ、コード切り替えは談話に関連していることが示唆された。コード切り替えは学習者が会話の流れを管理し円滑にする助けとなり、教室における学生と個人という二重のアイデンティティを表現する手段となっている。

Teachers may oppose the English Only movement on a sociopolitical level but accept English-only classroom management practices as common and natural (Auerbach, 1993). L1 use is couched in negative terms like "resort to" and "fall back on." In the literature on communication strategies, L1 use is labeled as a "compensatory strategy," problem solving in nature, used to overcome "insufficient linguistic resources" (Faerch & Kasper, 1983, p. 46). Tarone, Cohen and Dumas (1983) label it an "avoidance strategy" (p. 11). This attitude toward L1 use, as evidenced by the words "compensatory" and "avoidance," seems to focus negatively on learner interlanguage as linguistically inferior to the target language. Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) suggest that "instead of viewing interlanguage pragmatic knowledge and behavior as deficient in terms of native norms, we need to consider its functionality and inner justification" (p. 160).

L1 use by learners may be described as codeswitching (CS) behavior. That is learners switching back and forth between their L1 and their approximation of the L2. Legenhausen (1991) suggests that CS in learners be compared and contrasted with that of more proficient bilingual speakers. Codeswitching, "the alternative use by bilinguals of two or more languages in the same conversation" (Milroy & Muysken, 1995, p. 7), was thought to be abnormal, random behavior and indicative of a lack of language proficiency. The last 25 years of research on CS has contributed to its "rehabilitation" (Gardner-Chloros, 1991, p. 59). This research has demonstrated that language alternation is not arbitrary behavior but a type of "skilled performance" (Myers-Scotton, 1993c, p. 47), an important and "extremely common characteristic of bilingual speech" (Grosjean, 1982, p. 146).

Types of CS

The types of switching identified in the literature include: *tag*, *intersentential*, and *intrasentential* (Appel & Muysken, 1987; Poplack, 1980; Romaine, 1995). Tag-switching is the placing of a tag, an exclamation, a formulaic expression, or a discourse particle from one language into an utterance which is, except for that item, entirely in another language. Tag-switching has been referred to as emblematic switching because the switched item serves to identify an otherwise monolingual utterance as bilingual in character. Examples¹ of tag-switches are:

- 1) *Vendia arroz* (He sold rice) 'n shit. (Poplack, 1980, p. 589)
- 2) I guess it's good *yo ne* (right)? (Nishimura, 1995, p. 169)

An intersentential switch occurs at clause or sentence boundaries in one of the languages or between speaker turns (Romaine, 1995), as in:

- 3) Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English *y termino en espanol* (and finish it in Spanish). (Poplack, 1980, p. 594)

Intrasentential switching, sometimes called code mixing, involves a switch within a clause or sentence and sometimes even within word boundaries. Examples are:

- 4) Why make Carol *sentarse atras pa'que* (sit in the back so) everybody has to move *pa'que se salga* (for her to get out)? (Poplack, 1980, p. 589)
- 5) And it's hard, 'cause me- *nanka, moo, bon o nanka yomu to*, cover-to-cover *yomanakattara*, if I stop *dokka de*, I forget the story. (And it's hard, because a person like me, when I read a

book, unless I read it cover-to-cover, if I stop at some point, I forget the story.) (Nishimura, 1995, p. 178)

CS Research

The approach to CS has been interdisciplinary (Appel & Muysken, 1987; Milroy & Muysken, 1995; Tabouret-Keller, 1995). Researchers have attempted to locate and explain constraints on CS in terms of: a) how the bilingual mind works (psycholinguistic); b) the formal properties of linguistic systems (structural); and c) the social, historical and interactive processes of individuals and groups in language contact situations (sociolinguistic). Psycholinguistic aspects are not reviewed here.²

Structural aspects: Early studies tried to explain why particular points were chosen for switches. The free-morpheme constraint, proposed by Sankoff and Poplack (as cited in Romaine, 1995) predicted that "a switch may not occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless the lexical form has been phonologically integrated into the language of the morpheme" (Romaine, 1995, p. 126). The equivalence constraint (Lipski, 1978; Poplack, 1980) held that a switch may occur where the juxtaposition of forms from two codes does not violate a syntactic rule of either code.

Recent work on CS has taken different approaches. The Matrix Language-Frame (MLF) (Myers-Scotton, 1993a) claimed production-based switching with constraints occurs not at the surface phrase structure but at an abstract level, the "mental lexicon" of the bilingual (p. 485). Romaine (1995), suggesting that "a mixed code has its own rules and constraints," said a switched item may not be "predictable from the individual constituent structure rules of the two systems in contact" (p. 160). Researchers also asked whether constraints were language-specific or universal (Romaine, 1995).

The study of linguistic constraints involves differentiating between borrowing and codeswitching. Grosjean (1982) defined borrowing as "a word or short expression that is adapted phonologically and morphologically to the language being spoken" (p. 308). However, problems of overlap in the actual diagnosis of whether an individual case is a switch or loan occurred, as when a speaker pronounces all words, borrowed or otherwise, in the same accent. Poplack (1988) maintained there is a dichotomy which could be worked out methodologically. Gardner-Chloros (1995) argued that CS is not "separable, either ideologically or in practice from borrowing, interference or pidginisation" (p. 86). Myers-Scotton (1993b) urged that codeswitching and borrowing be seen as part of a continuum.

Sociolinguistic aspects: CS was thought to be “part of the performance of the imperfect bilingual, motivated by inability to carry on a conversation” (Myers-Scotton, 1993c, p. 47) and not a serious research topic. A study of Norwegian dialects (Blom & Gumperz, 1972) presented CS as a legitimate topic of research and stimulated research on CS between languages (Myers-Scotton, 1993c). Two general kinds of CS were posited (Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Gumperz, 1982). In *situational* switching, speakers switch when they perceive or when there is a change in setting, topic of conversation, or participants. In *conversational* or *metaphorical* switching, speakers create meaning by switching. Gumperz (1982) suggested that CS is a discourse strategy used by bilinguals in much the same way monolinguals use style shifting and prosody. In addition, Gumperz (1982) distinguished between a “we code” and a “they code,” usually the minority and majority languages respectively. Use of the “we code,” implying intimacy and informality, is associated with in-group and personal activities, while the “they code,” symbolizing authority and objectivity, marks more formal, less personal, out-group relations. Other CS functions included quotation, addressee specification, interjections, reiteration, and message qualification (Gumperz, 1982).

Other researchers have studied the functional aspects of CS. Poplack (1980) maintained that specific instances of switching in the smooth, rapid Spanish/English CS by Puerto Ricans in New York City cannot be assigned discourse functions. Rather, CS was the norm for this bilingual community. Poplack (1988) found a different pattern of CS among French/English bilinguals in the Ottawa-Hull community in Canada. These speakers drew attention to their CS by “repetition, hesitation, intonational highlighting” and “metalinguistic commentary” (p. 230). Language switching marked specific functions, including switching to provide an apt expression—*mot juste* switching (p. 228); to fill a lexical gap; to bracket or call attention to an English switch; and to explain, specify or translate.

The study of in-group speech repertoire of second generation Japanese-Canadian (Nisei) bilinguals (Nishimura, 1995) identified three speech varieties. In the basically Japanese variety, used with native Japanese speakers, CS serves to fill lexical gaps. In the basically English variety, used with each other, CS allows the speakers to express their shared ethnic identity. The mixed variety was used when the interlocutors included both native Japanese and Nisei. Nishimura (1995) categorized CS in the mixed variety into four groups: a) functions related to interactional (speaker/hearer) processes where Niseis tried to “reach

out" (p. 167) to both types of listeners or to enhance rapport; b) discourse organization functions where CS marked the beginning or ending of a frame or introduced a topic; c) functions carrying stylistic effects where Niseis marked quotations with a switch in order to make their speech "more lively" (p. 177); and d) functionally neutral CS where the motivation was not clear.

Some researchers have attempted to move on from a descriptive approach listing CS functions to a prescriptive approach treating CS patterns within an explanatory framework or model. Scotton and Ury (1977), who looked at Swahili/Luyia/English CS, explained CS as an extension of a speaker in terms of the relationships between participants and subject and the social meaning of a language choice. By using a switch, the speaker may redefine the social arena, or set of norms, of an interaction. By continually switching, the speaker may avoid specifying the social meaning of the interaction. In her study of French/Alsatian CS, Gardner-Chloros (1991) showed how switching was used by colleagues in work situations to create solidarity in spite of gaps in Alsatian competence, especially for younger speakers, and the lack of appropriate technical terms in Alsatian. CS "is connected with individual factors which concern people's linguistic histories as well as their personalities" (Gardner-Chloros, 1991, p. 184).

CS Research in the Classroom

Early research into classroom CS concentrated on the "communicative functions of code-switching in teacher-led talk and on the frequency with which particular languages were employed to perform different functions" (Martin-Jones, 1995, p. 90-1). Later studies looked at the "sequential flow of classroom discourse" and the interactional work of teachers and students from a conversational analytic approach with an ethnographic grounding (Martin-Jones, 1995, p. 91). This included studies on CS in EFL and ESL classrooms. Martin-Jones (1995) cited two studies by Lin (1988, 1990) on CS in Anglo-Chinese secondary schools in Hong Kong. In her 1988 classroom study, Lin found that the teacher, a Cantonese/English bilingual, used CS "as a communicative resource to signal unspoken social meanings" (p. 84). Fotos (1994, 1995) looked at CS in EFL classrooms in Japan. In her analysis of Japanese/English CS by Japanese university EFL students, Fotos (1995) found that the learners used switching into Japanese for emphasis, repetition, or clarification, as well as to signal that a mistake had been made in English and a repair was to follow. These functions call attention to the speakers' English utterances.

Foreign and second language learners may be thought of as incipient bilinguals (Kasper, 1994) and EFL/ESL classrooms as bi/multilingual communities. This study analyzes CS in a group of Japanese adult EFL learners to further understand the use of CS. What functions might L1 (Japanese) use or CS serve for developing bilingual speakers?

The Study

Method

Subjects: Five female students, Maki, Remi, Emi, Fumi, and Kono (not their real names), comprising an elementary level "conversation" class at a small private language school voluntarily participated. All had studied English at the secondary level and two had had a year of post-secondary lessons. They had attended language classes for three to seven years. Their ages ranged from 45 to 69.

Data Collection: Data were collected from the subjects' class sessions, following Gardner-Chloros' (1991) suggestion that naturally occurring classroom discourse rather than language elicited by experimental tasks is better suited for the study of CS. Data from retrospective oral interviews were also collected. Retrospective data were included for two reasons: first, this researcher hoped that the individual interviews would help raise the subjects' awareness of L1 use in the classroom and stimulate reflection, and second, that the verbal reports, "the learners' reports of their own intuitions and insight," would serve to "complement" (Cohen, 1987, p. 82) the classroom discourse data.

Class sessions: Fourteen two-hour class sessions were video and audio taped from May to October, 1994. This duration was selected to ensure that Ss would become accustomed to being recorded. Three sessions, from June and September, were transcribed. Only discourse involving the entire class was transcribed; pair work was not included. During pair work, the Ss inevitably spoke Japanese, but it was impossible to transcribe the separate pair conversations.

Transcription of the data is in standard English orthography. The Japanese switches, in italics, translated by the author³ into idiomatic English, appear in parentheses. Significant contextual information appears in brackets.

Interviews: Each subject was individually interviewed twice. All interviews were audio-taped. Each interview took place directly after a lesson and

lasted from one to two hours. Biographical data were collected in the first interview and retrospective data in the second.

During the first interview, Ss were asked about their English educational background and reasons for studying. Ss were told that they should feel free to use either Japanese or English and to request clarification whenever they did not understand. The researcher spoke mostly in English. During the interview, subjects were asked for comments on their use of Japanese in class.

During the second interview, the video tape of the lesson that had just taken place was shown. Subjects were asked to listen for instances when they used Japanese and to try to recall why they switched and what language they were thinking in when the switch occurred. Subjects were told that they could push the pause button whenever they wanted to make an observation or remembered something. I also tried to elicit comments from them on their CS.

Results and Analysis

Switches from one speaker's utterance to another's, and those within one speaker's utterance, were counted. Since the focus of this study is use of the L1, only switches from English to Japanese were considered.⁴

Table 1: Analysis of Switches to Japanese

Type of Switch	Frequency	%
Tags	39	8%
Interjections/Short-fixed Expressions	43	9%
<i>wa/ga</i>	3	1%
<i>janakute</i>	9	2%
Conjunctions	13	3%
<i>ja</i>	17	4%
Adjectives/Adverbs	18	4%
Nouns	45	10%
Fillers	48	10%
<i>nan to tu</i>	61	13%
Phrases/Sentences	164	35%
<i>ni naru/ni suru</i>	12	3%
Total	472	102%*

*Note: The Total equals more than 100% due to rounding.

Switches into the L1 designating place names and proper nouns were not included. Also excluded were loan-word status items like "bazaar" and "seminar" when they were used as attempts or approximations toward English. A phonological basis for determining whether a word was English or Japanese was not used since much of the subjects' interlanguage is highly accented.

As Table 1 shows, the learners frequently produced tag, interjection, noun, filler, and *nan to iu* (how do you say . . .) switches. Phrases and sentences were also a favored switch. Less fluent or L1 dominant bilinguals have been shown to prefer tag and single-item switches (McClure, 1981; Poplack, 1980). Fotos (1990), in her study of Japanese-English bilingual children's CS, found that single item and sentence switches were a "significant number of the total, 107 switches out of 153" (p. 84).

Tags: The most frequently used tag was *ne*. More than half of the tag switches were made by one learner, Fumi, who may have used *ne* as a mini-confirmation check (example 1) and as a repair acceptance marker (example 2). She also may have used *ne* to gain thinking time or keep her turn, saying she tried to use English as much as possible but felt that her English did not come out quickly enough.

1. Fumi: Matterhorn. But eh I can uh I can get to the, I could *ne*, I could get to the uh *eb* town . . .
2. Fumi: Healthness, healthy, mmm uh I I don't uh got a ill. I don't got after? uh after I
 Remi: After that.
 Fumi: After that, *ne*. After that I don't got the ill.

Subjects also used the tags *desboo*, *kana*, and *ka*.

Interjections and short-fixed expressions: Switched interjections included *masaka!* (no kidding!), *narubodo* (I see), and *e?* (what?); expressions included *gomen* (sorry) and *doomo arigatoo* (thank you). Other examples are:

3. T: I wore the earrings that I bought at the bazaar yesterday.
 Maki: *Maa!* (Oh!) [laughs] Many earrings you bought.
4. Fumi: One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight *ne*, plus eight.
 Kono: mmm
 Maki: *Sugoi!* (Wow!)

Maki and Remi reported in interviews that they were very aware of their Japanese classmates and sometimes used Japanese without thinking. Remi thought that she sometimes switched because she felt she had to respond in Japanese to her peers. Maki said she thought she used Japanese to be considerate of her classmates. The students appear to be using these switches to express personal feelings and to show solidarity with their peers. It is interesting to note, however, that in Example 3 Maki used an interjection switch in response to the teacher.

Wa and ga: There were three instances of *wa/ga* switches in the data. *Ga* is the subject marker and *wa* is the topic marker in Japanese.

5. Maki: Finish *ga*? (How about the finish?)
6. Emi: Finish *ga* October 14. (We finish on October 14.)
7. Maki: *Anoo* my lend *wa* very long time. Thank you very much.
(I have borrowed this a very long time.)

Fotos (1994) also found *wa/ga* switches in her college student CS data and cites them as evidence against the free-morpheme constraint because the markers should be connected to Japanese topics and subjects. However, Fotos (1990) noted in her earlier children's CS study that these Japanese particles may not be bound "in the sense that bound morphemes exist in English or Spanish" (p. 88).

Nishimura (1989) found that second generation Japanese-American and Japanese-Canadian bilingual speakers, who all said they were better in English than in Japanese, stated a topic in Japanese then switched to a comment in English. The speakers' "thinking process is topic-comment" with the topic part realized in Japanese and the comment produced in English (p. 376). In Nishimura's (1995) Japanese-Canadian Nisei study, bilinguals speaking in the mixed variety marked topics with *wa*, using it to imply a contrast in order to "to single out something in a discourse" and "to indicate the reintroduction of a topic" (p. 174).

However, regarding the current study, the data are too limited to make a meaningful interpretation of the subjects' *wa* and *ga* switches. In addition, the grammaticality of example 7 is suspect.

Janakute and ja: In her study of Japanese college student CS, Fotos (1994) noted the students' use of *janakute* to signal that the preceding utterance was incorrect and would be repaired. She also noted use of *ja* to attract and focus attention on the utterance to follow. Similar instances were found.

8. T: So you had some time to think about your one minute speech. Okay, now who would like to be the first speaker?
 SS: [laughs]
 Maki: *Ja*, I'll try.
9. Fumi: Uh there uh there is there there isn't there isn't uh penici penicillin *janakute* strep strep streptomycin mmm.

Conjunctions: Ss seemed to use conjunctions to help sort out their thoughts and get their messages out. As with tag switches, these may have been used to gain thinking time. Fumi said she wanted to speak English correctly so she was always thinking about whether or not she had made a mistake. Kono said that when something was difficult to express, Japanese seemed to just come out.

10. Fumi: Yes, Switzerland, uh there is there are uh four language in Switzerland, French, eh *eto* German
 Kono: *Doitsu* (Germany). Germany.
 Fumi: Germany
 T: German
 Kono: German
 Fumi: Germany, *sorekara* (and), Germany, German, English and eh, Romansh.⁵
11. Kono: Yes, mm one time is Thursday night, mm *dakedo* (but) mm I have one time *dakedo* (but) mm I *nandakke na* (what was it) mm I hope is two time not not uh another schedule, is one time.

In Example 10, Fumi may be trying to gain time to think or work out the mistake. In Example 11 Kono may be using *dakedo* to get meaning across.

Adverbs and adjectives: Adverb and adjective switches appeared to function as ways to express personal feelings and show solidarity with classmates. In one instance Kono read a sentence and the other students had to guess who it was about.

12. Kono: started working thirty years a...go, go *ga okashii*. (go seems strange)
 T: (laughs)
 Emi: *Ja*, Kono [laughs]. (Well, I guess that's about you.)
 Maki: *Tereteru* [laughs]. (Kono feels self-conscious.)

Maki expressed her feelings about Kono in Japanese. During the interview, Maki said that her first priority was not always to practice English but to communicate with friends.

Fillers: Fumi and Remi made most of the filler switches. During the interview, Fumi said she had not been aware of using *anoo* until asked about it. Remi used the word *nani* (what) as a filler and reported that it had the feeling of “uh” for her.

13. Fumi: K *anoo* Tomohiro Museum uh where where is *anoo*
 Remi: Kusaki Dam? Near the Kusaki Dam.
 14. Remi: How was your mother? Walk uh *nani* she took for a walk, uh took walk?

The filler switches may be functioning as a way to gain time and/or to show that the speaker needs help.

Nouns: Nouns were switched frequently. In a conversation about the summer water shortage, Maki explained how she tried to conserve water by giving plants the water she saved from washing rice (*kome*). She ended up using more water because she had to rinse out a rag (*zokin*).

15. Maki: Yes mmm but I I try the uh *kome* rice rice wash a *ko* uh rice. Uh, it's plant [laughs] but a roof roof of the uh wet I [laughs] had uh *zokin*.

For Maki in this instance, the Japanese word, *kome*, may have been more available than the English word, rice. While reporting on her performance in general, Maki said that she knew her ability was not very high and felt impatient while trying to communicate what she really wanted to talk about. She felt she had to explain herself more completely and add more even if it meant using an L1 word.

While talking about her trip to Switzerland, Fumi repeated “glacier lake” in Japanese. She may have thought that it was a difficult term for her classmates and switched to clarify the meaning.

16. Fumi: Switzerland very beautiful country, mountain and lake, eh glacier lake, eh *hyogaka no mizu*, very deep, deep green color.

Fumi said she sometimes uses a Japanese word because she hoped someone would give her an L2 equivalent, i.e. she fished for English words from the class.

Remi, while discussing a similar instance of noun switching (*minami juujisei* for the Southern Cross), said that she switched to Japanese to make sure that her classmates understood what she was talking about.

Nan to iu: Maki made more than half of the *nan to iu* switches. These switches seemed to have been made when the learners did not know the L2 word or could not come up with the item quickly enough.

17. Maki: . . . I tomorrow today morning this morning I take uh
I my grandchild take a *boikuen te nan to iu no?* (How do you say nursery school in English?)
18. Emi: Who is play?
Kono: Uh James uh mmm uh James *nandakke naa?* [laughs]
Let's see, James what?)

The learners seem to be using these switches to gain time or request help with a word. Variations include *nandakke*, *te iu no*, and *te ieba ii no*.

Phrases and sentences: The Ss used numerous L1 phrase and sentence switches. They sometimes switched to Japanese to speak among themselves, effectively excluding this researcher from the conversation. During one lesson, the women seemed sleepy toward the end so we did some simple bending and stretching exercises to wake up. After the exercises this conversation took place:

19. Remi: *Kyoo wa sugoku tsukareru.* (I'm very tired today.)
SS: Uh, mmm [laughs]
T: Okay, now, okay.
Maki: *Kimari ga ii yoo na ki ga sbite, koko de.* (I feel as if this would be a good time to end the lesson.)

Fotos (1994) found instances of CS where feelings are expressed in Japanese and factual information in English in her college student data. Similar instances were collected.

20. Remi: Raise your left hand and stretch.
T: Stretch. That feels good.
Remi: And put it down. Bend your *nani* um bend you *mae*.
[laughs] *Zenbu wasureteru.* (Bend your what um bend forward. I have forgotten how to say everything in English.)
21. Maki: Yes, maybe. [laughs]
SS: [fanning selves, whispering]

Maki: *Nugenai no konna no. Hazukashii.* (I can't take this off. I'm embarrassed.) [laughs] I have a plan.

In example 20 Remi gives commands in English and in 21 Maki answers in the TL, then both switch to the L1 to express feelings of helplessness and embarrassment.

Ni naru *and* ni suru: These intrasentential switches were very simple. They require little grammatical control and they do not violate the equivalence constraint.

22. Maki: Short break *ni suru?* (Shall we take a short break?)
 23. Emi: Five weeks *ni naru.* (It will be five weeks.)

Discussion

The use of L1 switches such as tags, conjunctions, fillers, nouns, and *nan to iu* may help learners gain thinking time, smooth the conversation, get important points across, and signal for help. *Ja* and *janakute* switches may function to attract and focus attention on important L2 content and utterances. The subjects may be using interjection, adjective, adverb, noun, and sentence switches to express personal feelings and confirm their solidarity. The learners' CS might be labeled discourse-related switching (Martin-Jones, 1995), "speaker oriented" because it "serves as a resource for accomplishing different communicative acts at specific points within interactional sequences" (p. 99).

The motivations underlying the learners' language switching appear to be similar to some of the factors Gardner-Chloros (1991) gives for French/Alsatian bilingual CS in Strasbourg. Gardner-Chloros (1991) said CS is a kind of compromise

between the exclusive use of one language and of the other, each with their respective cultural connotations; there are occasions, for example, when it seems too snobbish to speak French but too rustic to speak Alsatian and code-switching provides the solution. (p.184)

For EFL learners, it may seem too impersonal or difficult to speak English but too unlearner-like to speak Japanese. Thus, they codeswitch.

The motivations Nishimura (1995) outlined for Japanese/English Nisei CS might also be compared to those underlying these subjects' CS. Nishimura (1995) said the Niseis used their mixed variety when speaking to both native Japanese speakers and other Niseis to "reach out" to both types of speakers and "enhance rapport between speaker and the

hearer" (p. 167-169). Japanese EFL learners may want or need to involve both the teacher and each other in communication, or they may be appealing to their dual identities of L1 speaker and L2 learner.

Legenhausen (1991) called CS a mode or register which learners feel to be the proper expression of their ambivalent psychological state, pitched between responsibility for their own learning process on the one hand, and their natural inclination to use their L1 in any communicative situation on the other. (p. 71)

The subjects here are in the classroom not just to learn English. They are individuals who appear quite aware of each other and who seem to want to get along. This may explain Fumi's switch:

24. T: [to Fumi] Comment, question or comment?
 Fumi: Eh, okay, mmm eh, eh, *chotto saki ni, moo jikan ga mottainai*. (Please let someone else go ahead, I'm taking up too much time.)

As Burt (1990) found in her study of learner CS, "it is not always polite to be an extremely conscientious language learner" (p. 34).

It is important for teachers to keep in mind that foreign or second language learners are not becoming monolingual, they are becoming bilingual (Kasper, 1994). Our standards of competency and performance should include bi/multilingual models. There is also much to learn about the teaching and learning processes through the study of CS in the classroom. Martin-Jones (1995) argued that

a conversational analytic approach to code switching in classroom discourse, grounded in ethnographic observation, can give ... fine grained descriptions of the ways in which teachers and learners get things done bilingually in the classroom. (p. 103)

This study has been limited to learner CS in the classroom. Future studies should look at CS in the interactive discourse of teacher and students.

Notes

1. In the examples, the language other than English is in italics and an idiomatic translation follows in parentheses.
2. See Grosjean (1982) for an introduction to CS from a psycholinguistic perspective.
3. The author's Japanese, Level One on the Japanese-Language Proficiency Test (December, 1992), was considered sufficient for these translations.
4. It should be noted that more information might have been gained by looking at switching from both directions.

5. Romansh was recognized as Switzerland's fourth national (though not federally official) language in 1938.

Ethel Ogane teaches at a private language school and a private university in the Kanto area. She has an M.A. in TESOL from Teachers College, Columbia University and is currently pursuing an Ed.D. in TESOL at Temple University Japan.

References

- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Auerbach, E.R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 9-32.
- Blom, J., & Gumperz, J.J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J.J. Gumperz, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 407-434). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Burt, S.M. (1990). External and internal conflict: Conversational code-switching and the theory of politeness. *Sociolinguistics*, 19, 21-35.
- Cohen, A. D. (1987). Using verbal reports in research on language learning. In C. Faerch, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Introspection in second language research* (pp. 82-95). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1983). *Strategies in language communication*. London: Longman.
- Fotos, S.S. (1990). Japanese-English code switching in bilingual children. *JALT Journal*, 12, 75-98.
- Fotos, S.S. (1994, October). Japanese-English code switching in EFL classrooms. Paper presented at the JALT International Conference, Matsuyama, Japan.
- Fotos, S.S. (1995, September). Using Japanese to learn English: Codeswitching in the EFL classroom. Paper presented at the JACET (Japan Association of College English Teachers) Annual Conference, Tokyo.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991). *Language selection and switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1995). Codeswitching in community, regional and national repertoires: The myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In L. Milroy, & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross disciplinary perspectives on code switching* (pp. 68-89). Cambridge: CUP.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Kasper, G. (1994, May). A bilingual perspective on interlanguage pragmatics. Paper presented at the Tokyo-JALT Annual May Conference, Tokyo.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York:

OUP.

- Legenhause, L. (1991). Code-switching in learners' discourse. *IRAL*, 29, 61-73.
- Lin, A.M.Y. (1988). Pedagogical and para-pedagogical levels of interaction in the classroom: A social interactional approach to the analysis of the codeswitching behaviour of a bilingual teacher in an English language lesson. *University of Hong Kong, Language Centre, Working Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 11.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1990). Teaching in two tongues: Language alternation in foreign language classrooms. *City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, Department of English, Research Report 3*.
- Lipski, J. M. (1978). Code switching and the problem of bilingual competence. In M. Paradis (Ed.). *Aspects of bilingualism* (pp.250-274). Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.
- Martin-Jones, M. (1995). Codeswitching in the classroom: Two decades of research. In L. Milroy, & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross disciplinary perspectives on code switching* (pp. 90-111). Cambridge: CUP.
- McClure, E. (1981). Formal and functional aspects of the codeswitched discourse of bilingual children. In R.P. Duran (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 69-94). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross disciplinary perspectives on codeswitching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a). Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Language in Society*, 22, 475-503.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b). *Dueling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993c). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Nishimura, M. (1989). The topic comment construction in Japanese-English code-switching. *World Englishes*, 8, 365-377.
- Nishimura, M. (1995). A functional analysis of Japanese/English codeswitching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23, 157
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en Español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.
- Poplack, S. (1988). Contrasting patterns of codeswitching in two communities. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 215-244). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Scotton, C.M., & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: The social functions of code-switching. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 13, 5-20.
- Tabouret-Keller, A. (1995). Conclusion: Codeswitching research as a theoretical challenge. In L. Milroy, & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross disciplinary perspectives on codeswitching* (pp. 344-355).

Cambridge: CUP.

Tarone, E., Cohen, A. D., & Dumas, G. (1983). A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: A framework for communication strategies. In C. Faerch, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 4-14). London: Longman.

(Received August 15, 1995; revised December 11, 1996)