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Children in the Early Years Classrooms Code-Switching

Daniele Chahine

Abstract

This paper focuses on the different reasons students code-switch, how they code-switch, why, where and when they code-switch. It attempts to show how much students have been code-switching nowadays. This paper also attempts to describe the reasons young children code-switch in the classroom with one another. The two instruments used in order to explore the issue of code-switching in the Early Years classrooms were participant observation, where observation of students were made in different classes and documentation of their dialogue was recorded, and teacher interviews, where interviews were conducted with five teachers in the Early Years department. The results showed that children tended to code-switch in order to negotiate the language for their interaction and to adapt to other students’ favoured language and their capability in addition to manage conversational talk. The results also showed that code-switching is employed as a supplementary resource to attain certain conversational objectives in interactions with other bilingual speakers. Research should be conducted on the on the presentation of the literature on mixing in bilingual children during the earliest of language acquisition. More research should also be done on students’ code-switching and the reasons they code-switch should be made.

Keywords: Bilingualism, code-switching, multilingualism, code-mixing, Lebanon, pre-school.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Lebanon is a multilingual society. This is mainly seen in the streets, on the billboard, the way people address each other, etc. Many people are bilingual, trilingual if not multilingual. In fact, this multi-language interaction has always existed in Lebanon, and one can even notice it when youngsters are communicating with each other or with adults using different languages. In many of the Lebanese schools children learn simultaneously two if not three languages from the age of 3 onwards. In fact, research has shown that the best time to teach a child a language is at an early age. Children are able to learn a language much faster than adults. Discovering the words of a language, and what they mean in the world, is only the first step for the language learner. Children must implicitly discover and use the grammar of their language to determine who did what to whom in each sentence (Saffran, Senghas & Trueswell, 2000).

Conversation comprises a key part of human communication. It is in the course of language and conversation that children begin to communicate information through a number of speech registers and style switching (Ervin-Tripp, 2001). Of particular interest to sociolinguistic and developmental researchers is the impressive ability of bilingual speakers to switch with ease at different points in conversation. From the sociolinguist’s point of view, code switching is studied to understand why people who are competent in two languages alternate languages in a particular conversation or situation. The concept of code-switching, as defined by Gumperz (1973), refers to the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation.
If you were to ask a Lebanese person what is the language of Lebanon, most people would say Arabic, but is it (Thonhauser, 2000)? There is a difference between spoken Arabic and written, to me they are two different types of dialect, for one I cannot read or write in Arabic since I have lived abroad all my life. I find it extremely difficult to understand the newsreaders when listening to them tell the news. But it is just the informal Arabic that we speak in Lebanon and use more. My answer would be a straight forward no. English and French can be included in the Languages spoken in Lebanon. Since there are a great number of people who have lived abroad such as myself, I find it easier to speak or explain something to someone in English. A lot of the times when people such as myself cannot find the right word in Arabic they tend to code-switch to the second language they speak even though it would be considered their first since being brought up and raised abroad.

As indicated by Cantone (2007), the presentation of the literature on mixing in bilingual children during the earliest of language acquisition concentrates on three main questions. First, what does the phenomenon of mixing look like in bilingual children? Most of the studies on bilingual language acquisition state that there is a stage in which children tend to mix to a great extent. This stage is said to suddenly disappear. Second, why do bilingual children mix at all? Does language mixing depend on the development of the two lexicons? This presupposes that the mixed word is only available in one language, that is, that the equivalent word has not been acquired yet. Or is the mixing due to a different development of the two grammars, in the sense that children tent to mix words from the more developed language into the slower one? The third question to be answered is what kind of elements do children mix, in order to reveal whether children mix different elements than adults.
The following research study examines the reasons children in the Early Years classes code-switch. This study involves student observations and teacher interviews in order to understand the reasons bilingual children code-switch in different settings in school.

Statement of Purpose

This paper focuses on the different reasons students code-switch, how they code-switch, why, where and when they code-switch. It attempts to show how much students have been code-switching nowadays. This paper also attempts to describe the reasons young children code-switch in the classroom with one another. People code-switch everywhere you go, in malls, on the streets, in schools, universities, in institutions and the like. It seems that even people who are not fluent in more than one language are code-switching. They may be fluent in one language but not the other. Some students have to code-switch because they cannot use any other word since there is no replacement in either L1 or L2. According to Reyes (2004) from the linguistics’ point of view, code-switching is studied to understand why people who are competent in one language alternate languages in a particular conversation or situation. Most of the early research on code-switching was conducted on adults and some interest in studying how bilingual children shift from one language to another (Reyes, 2004).

Research Context

This study is carried out in a private school situated in the city of Beirut in a privileged and advantaged area. The school provides education for both Lebanese and international students. Instruction in school is given in English with the exception to the Arabic classes. English is the instructional language since it is an American school situated in Lebanon and all other subjects will be taught in English in the higher classes with the exception of Arabic.
school is a nonprofit school where it educates advantaged students. Not all children in the school are Lebanese, many of the children come from different countries such as Australia, USA, England, Syria, Japan, Jordan, China and France. The Early Years division includes eight classes which are divided into three sections; two nursery classes with three teachers in each class, three kindergarten I classes with two teachers in each class and three kindergarten II classes with two teachers in each class.

Most parents at the school the research was conducted at speak to their children in a language other than Arabic, whether it being English, French, Portuguese or German. This was noticed when parents entered the classroom and conversations were carried out between them and their children in many languages. During my interaction with parents it was clear that they wanted their children to learn more than one language since in Lebanon many of the people are now becoming trilingual. Other parents had lived abroad and wanted their children to learn the language since their family is at one point going back to the country they were living at.

Research Questions

This paper attempts to focus on students’ code-switching in the classroom. Evaluation will be made on how students code-switch when talking to different people or with one another. For instance what do children do if they don’t know a certain word in a particular language. Do they use gestures, non-verbal communication or code-switch because they are talking about a particular subject, or is it because it just comes naturally and unconsciously with that particular person. Do they code-switch because they don’t know the language well or do they not know the word in that specific language. Do these students code-switch because the people they are with spoke a word in one language and that got the flow going in the other language. I will also
evaluate when these students code-switch, whether it’s when giving an instruction, just talking to their friends, or when explaining something, or do they code-switch during play. Some of the questions posed are the following:

1. Who do the students code-switch with?

2. In which context do these students code-switch (in the classroom, in the playground, during Arabic/English class etc.)?

3. Why do these students code-switch with these particular people?

4. Why do students code-switch?

Definition of terms

According to Cantone (2007), *language mixing* means when a word of language A or an utterance which contains elements from languages A and B is mixed into the language context of language B. The term *early mixing* states that we are dealing with language mixing at an early stage of language acquisition.

Stockwell (2007) defines *code-switching* as a linguistic term conveying the simultaneous use of more than one language, or language variety, in conversation. Multilinguals sometimes use elements of multiple languages in conversing with each other. Thus, code-switching is the syntactically and phonologically appropriate use of more than one linguistic variety.

According to Stockwell (2007), *intersentential switch* refers to topic change within the same speakers conversing at the same time.
Intrasentential switch refers to when speakers switch language or variation within the same sentence (Stockwell, 2007).

This research project is divided into five main chapters. Chapter one highlights the introduction of the project and mentions some aspects of code-switching in Lebanon. Chapter two focuses on the literature review and discusses the different views of a number of researcher. Chapter three covers the methodology to be undertaken in this project along with its procedures. Chapter four concentrates on the results and discussion of the project and chapter five reveals the conclusion of the project.

Conclusion

A brief introduction on code-switching and the Lebanese society was introduced in this chapter. This chapter has also emphasized the purpose of the study, definition of terms, the five research questions to be answered and the research context. The next chapter will review the literature available on code-switching and bilingualism.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

This chapter emphasizes the different aspects of code-switching in Lebanon and other countries. The literature review is mainly a review of different studies that have been conducted by various researchers it focuses on different definitions of code-switching, why bilingual speakers code-switch and the reasons why they code-switch.

Language and Lebanese Nationalism

Suleiman (2003) mentions that in Lebanon three main languages share the linguistic space that makes up the Lebanese cultural scene. The spread of English in Lebanon is attributed to its role as a global language of business and international relations, although its presence in the country goes back to the nineteenth century. The other two languages, Arabic and French, are intimately interwoven with issue of national identity in Lebanon. It’s generally believed that Muslims in particular are the main supporters of this variety and the nationalist ideology. Support for French on the Lebanese cultural scene is generally linked to the conceptualization of Lebanese national identity which propel it outside the Arab Orbit and lodge it in this sphere of a western or non-Islamic Mediterranean culture. Under this interpretation, Lebanon is in the Middle East but it is not exclusively of it. Lebanese national identity is therefore not purely Arab or purely Western, but must partake of both to remain genuinely authentic and true to its routes. The presence of French is seen now as part of a long established multilingual tradition in Lebanon which take the country back to the times of the Phoenicians, for whom multilingualism was a fact of life (Suleiman, 2003).
Language Competence in Bilinguals and Multilinguals

When discussing an individual’s capability to use more than one language we use the terms bilingual or multilingual. An individual’s native language is called the vernacular which is the mother tongue and is sometimes referred to as L1. Many people go on to learn a new language later in life and become fluent in a second language referred to as L2 (Stockwell, 2007). Stockwell (2007) has argued that multilinguals develop competence in the languages they know to the extent that they need it and for the context in which each of the languages is used. If people are to be socially competent in a society which includes people of speakers of more than one language you need to find out who uses what, when and for what purpose. Different people choose to use languages distinctively; therefore, their language choices are part of the social identity they claim themselves (Stockwell, 2007).

According to Wardhaugh (2006), most bilingual and multilingual speakers demand several varieties of any language they speak. It usually involves selecting a specific code whenever they choose to speak; they may also decide to switch from one code to another or mix codes even within sometimes very short utterances and thereby create a new code in a process known as code-switching. Code-switching can occur between speakers’ turns and even within a speaker’s turn. Wardhaugh (2006) assumes that there are a number of different reasons why a person switches from one language to another. These reasons may include solidarity, accommodation of listeners, choice of topic, and perceived social and cultural distance. Using different varieties of one language may not always be a choice for a particular person, it may happen unconsciously while a speaker is conversing with a person who speaks the same languages as he/she does. For many speakers it seems that they are not aware that they use one particular variety of a language rather than another or sometimes that they have switched
languages either between or within utterances. Martin (2005) argues that code-switching results from a conscious decision to create a desired effect and to promote the validity of the person’s heritage languages. Not only can multilingual or bilingual speakers benefit from the resources of two languages, but they can add meaning by choosing when and in what situations to change languages (Martin, 2005). This enhances their decision process, giving them access to a wider set of vocabulary and terms that can be used to inherently describe and express a thought process; it’s a great benefit that not only makes a typical conversation with a bilingual colleague easier but adds a sense of fluidity to the process. How fair is it for bilingually colleagues to code-switch in direct contact with a unilingual colleague is another matter for debate as the thought process can be different and adapting to a unilingual whilst speaking to a bilingual in a three way conversation requires awareness and adaptation.

In face-to-face communication we can, directly or indirectly, refer to the more or less agreed upon differences in power and status between two or more languages which are at our disposal for a particular piece if communication. This reference we can use to establish our own power base, which we can choose to employ in particular communication situations. By this measure, speakers of some languages, or a variety of languages, automatically can expect to be able to wield more power than speakers of some other languages, or varieties, everything else being equal (Jorgensen, 1998).

According to Kenny (1996) although there has been some debate whether the ability to code-switch is an important indicator of bilingual fluency, there is little doubt that code-switching is a highly effective communicative device for bilingual speakers in a variety of situations. The importance of fluent code-switching for conveying culturally “loaded” information, to communicate group membership, and as a discourse strategy in storytelling has
been commented upon in a number of recent studies. Abu-Melhim (1991) investigated code-switching in relation to interdialectal accommodation strategies. He however, has noted that code-switching occurs at constituent boundaries and is related to speech hesitations. These findings, which confirm those of other studies on locational constraints, suggest that code-switch episodes are likely to be a locus of speech processing activity and the resultant hesitations, false starts, and speech errors that typically occur at constituent boundaries. Such observations open the door for a new approach to examining code-switching, one that focuses on speech fluency factors rather than the syntactical or structural aspects of spoken texts (Abu-Melhim, 1991).

**Defining Code-Switching**

Jourdan and Tuite (2006) mentioned that the term code-switching was largely meant to capture a form of bilingual behaviour which has been thought to allow for particular fine-grained empirical analysis of the relationship between bilingualism and linguistic theory, that is, the intersections of codes in bilingual performance. The concept of code is clearly related to that of language, insofar as both refer to autonomous and bounded linguistic systems. Jourdan and Tuite (2006) mention that in literature it has been largely preferred to make a distinction between large-scale moves from one language to another (from one set of activities or group of speakers to the next), and the kind of close relations within utterances or conversations that analysts have wished to understand (Jourdan & Tuite, 2006). However, the boundaries between such phenomena are usually fuzzy, and so it is no surprise that there has been plenty of definitions of code-switching which have been difficult to classify.

Myers-Scotton (2006, p.239) defines code-switching as “the use of two language varieties in the same conversation.” When two languages are used within the same clause,
theoretically both could control aspects of grammatical structure.  For example, noun phrases could meet the well-formedness conditions of one language, and verb phrases could be structured by the other language (Myers-Scotton 2006). Myers-Scotton (2006) points out that there is a range of structures that qualify as code-switching which include; inter-sentential code-switching and intra-sentential code-switching.

Code-switching as defined by Skiba (1997) is the alternation between two codes (languages and/or dialects), between people who share those particular codes. Choices about how code-switching manifests itself are determined by a number of social and linguistic factors. It is quite typical in multicultural and immigrant populations. Code-switching can take on several forms including alteration of sentences, phrases from both languages, and switching in a long narrative. Skiba (1997) mentions that in normal conversations between two bilinguals, code-switching consists of eighty-four percent single word switches, ten percent phrase switches, and six percent clause switching.

Code-switching can involve the alteration between two different languages, two tonal registers, or a dialectical shift within the same language (Flowers, 2000). Code-switching is a social process that functions on many levels. The act of code-switching is not solely indicative or compensatory for language weakness, it is a strategy at negotiating power for the speaker (Jonsberg, 2001).

Stockwell provide examples of different types of code-switching which include: tag-switching, intersentential switch, and intrasentential switch. Tag switching involves a speaker borrowing a word from another language because he/she lacks the necessary vocabulary in that certain language. Intersentential switch refers to topic change within the same speakers conversing at the same time. Intrasentential switch refers to when speakers switch language or
variation within the same sentence. Wardhaugh (2006, p.101) defines inter-sentential switch as
switching language between sentences and describes intra-sentential switch as a switch in
language within a single sentence. Edwards (1995, p.73) describes intrasentential switching as
lexical interference and repeated switching within a single sentence. He also describes tag-
switching as:

Where a stock element in one language is joined to an utterance in another

An example of tag switching in Lebanon would be “Yalla let’s go.”

Edwards (1995, p. 74) also defines intersentential switching/mixing as:

Where the change occurs as a clause or sentence boundary

An example of intersentential switch would be “tell them to come here ana ktir marida.”

An example of intrasentential mixing would be “This morning akhadet binti la3and el
babysitter.”

Gumperz, (1973), refers to the concept of code-switching as an alternate use of two or
more languages in the same utterance or conversation. Most of the early research on code-
switching has looked at adult–adult interaction. However, the early 1980s witnessed increased
interest in studying children’s code-switching. These studies have shed some light on how
bilingual children use different languages according to the addressee and context. These studies
do not describe how children develop code-switching over the years, and how code-switching is
used to extend communicative competence for achieving conversational goals during peer
interaction. In the classic code-switching study by Poplack (1980) with Puerto Rican American
bilinguals, she analyzed adults’ conversations in natural settings and speech during a
sociolinguistic interview to learn about bilinguals’ linguistic competence and their use of code-switching. Poplack’s findings pointed out that code-switching was used by those individuals whose language skills in both languages were balanced.

Wardhaugh (2006) talks about two kinds of code-switching. They include: situational code-switching and metaphorical code-switching. In situational code-switching speakers change language according to the situation the people conversing with each other find themselves in and they continue to converse in the same topic. Metaphorical code-switching is when speakers change topics which most of the times requires change of language. Gumperz (1989) refers to metaphorical code-switching as the tendency to switch codes in conversation in order to discuss a topic that would normally fall into another conversational domain. Situational code-switching refers to alternation between varieties redefining a situation, being a change in governing norms, and metaphorical switching, where alternation enriches a situation, allowing for allusion to more than one social relationship within the situation.

Gumperz (1982, p.98), defines conversational code-switching as “the juxtaposition with the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” and distinguishes it from the so-called “situational code-switching”. Situational code-switching is related to differences in classes of activities bound to certain settings in “a simple, almost one to one, relationship between language use and social context, whereas conversational code-switching usually is “metaphorical” by communicating information about how the speakers “intend their words to be understood” (Gumperz, 1982, p.98).

Based on several decades of research on bilingual interaction, code-switching is defined as the systematic alternating use of two languages or language varieties within a single
conversation or utterance which is a characteristic feature of bilinguals' speech rather than a sign of a deficiency in one language or the other (Li, 2000, p. 17). In interactional contexts, code-switching has been shown to serve both discourse related functions, which organize conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance, and participant related functions, which are switches corresponding to the preferences of the individual who performs the switching or those of co-participants in the conversation (Auer, 1998). Although this distinction was originally based on observations of bilingual interaction in non-institutional settings, Martin-Jones (2000) argues, based on the fact that classrooms often include groups of people with differing language abilities and communicative repertoires, that this distinction is particularly useful for research on classroom interaction. It has been found that participant-related switching by learners in classroom interaction often consists of what Ludi (2003, p. 176) describes as an attempt to override communicative stumbling blocks by falling back on the first language.

Language Mixing

Although much has been written on how bilinguals organize their two languages in memory, little is known about why bilinguals mix their two languages during the communicative process. Code-switching, or language mixing, occurs when a word or a phrase in one language substitutes for a word or phrase in a second language (Li, 1996). For example, consider the sentence, “Hala bado ijib sweets baba.” The word “sweets” in English replaces the word “helou” in Arabic. Why is the word “sweets” chosen instead of the correct word in Arabic? Given the speed with which spoken language occurs, and the cognitive resources required during the comprehension and integration of different linguistic factors (e.g., phonological, grammatical, and semantic information), one would expect bilinguals not to switch languages, especially if
retrieving a word from a second language takes more time than retrieving a word or concept from the same language (Heredia & Altarriba, 2001).

Kemp (2007) states that bilinguals mix two languages, but it is not always regarded as a grammatical way of speaking. Often people rather consider it as an inability to separate the two languages when speaking. Additionally, even researchers did not abandon the idea that code-switching is non-systematic for a long time. There is much evidence that in studies on bilingual speech bilinguals tend to mix their languages during conversation, often within single utterances (Kemp, 2007).

Cantone (2007) stated that most of the studies on language mixing try to explain mixing in young bilinguals by referring to a lack. It is either a lack of *pragmatic competence*, in the sense that children are not yet capable of separating the languages with respect to the interlocutor; or it is the absence of the *lexical competence*, meaning they do not know the word in one language and therefore use the equivalent word in the other language; or finally a lack of *grammatical competence*, that is, the children will use certain structures which have already been acquired in one language but not the other.

Despite claiming that in bilinguals the two languages develop separately, some kind of interaction might still show up. The most evident *interference* is language dominance, namely, when one language is stronger than the other. This might lead to unidirectional mixing, because most words are only available in one language (hence, dominance becomes visible in the different size of the two lexicons when compared to each other). More evidence in favour of dominance is given when structures of the more developed language are mixed into the less developed language. Another instance of interaction between the two languages is mixing due to
the lack of language separation. By contrast, one of the main claims in the present work is to show that early mixing can be viewed as identical to code-switching (Cantone, 2007).

A number of literature study on peer interactions in multilingual situations demonstrate that youngsters and school-age children use code-switching for a number of functions, such as constructing play, games, and other activities, discussing meanings and rights, and maintaining their shifting identities and adherence (Cromdal, 2004b). Young bilingual children, as older children and adults, may pragmatically switch languages for emphasis, clarification, or addressee specification, or to acquire or maintain attention (Lanza, 1997). However, children’s use of two or more languages to create imaginary adult roles during natural pretend play, specifically when adults are not present, has received little systematic awareness. Nonetheless the ways in which children utilize the language diversities accessible to them to represent different kinds of people, activities, and situations offer insights into their developing understandings of linguistic variation and multilingualism, language attitudes, and the links between language and social identity (Paugh, 2005).

Multilinguals are experienced language learners who use three or more languages without necessarily having equal control of all domains in all their languages. Researchers have proposed that multilinguals may differ in increased positive effect such as motivation, attitudes and self-confidence, conceptual knowledge and intuition, and an emerging ability to focus attention (Kemp, 2007). Results identify motivation, exposure, language attitudes, language use, and language knowledge of the L1 and L2 as independent variables significantly related to the overall L3 achievement (Ramsay, 1980, p.234).
Code-switching is a time consuming process since a “two switch mechanism” determines which of the bilingual’s two mental lexicons will be “on” or “off” during the course of language processing. Macnamara and Kushnir (1971) viewed the input switch as functioning at lower levels of perception and output switch as higher-order mechanism that is under the bilingual’s voluntary control and responsible for the selection of the language used in producing speech. According to this model, the input switch is responsible for selecting the appropriate lexicon to be employed during the comprehension of a sentence. Although this switch is automatic and beyond voluntary control, it takes an observable amount of time to operate. Therefore, during the presentation of a spoken sentence, if the acoustic signal matches English, this switch selects the English linguistic system to process the sentence (Heredia & Altarriba, 2001).

Why do bilinguals code-switch? One of the most frequent explanations of why bilinguals code-switch is that they do it to compensate for lack of language proficiency (Heredia & Altarriba, 2001). The argument is that bilinguals code-switch because they don’t know either language fluently. One major weakness of this view is that it does not allow for the possibility that code-switching is due to failure to retrieve the correct word. This inability to remember is reminiscent of the classic tip-of-the-tongue phenomenon, in which people are sometimes unable to remember information that they know (Heredia & Altarriba, 2001).

Studies by Lanza (1997), report that as children get older, they develop and use more sophisticated discourse strategies. The nature of language development in these developing bilinguals must be understood in relation to their development of bilingual communicative competence (Genesee, 2002). In other words, as bilingual children become older, their exposure to different social and linguistic experiences increases, and these experiences in turn affect and enlarge their knowledge and ability to use their different languages and to deploy code-switching
for sociolinguistic purposes. Subsequently, children’s patterns of using language and code-switching often mirror the ways in which language is used in their communities (Lanza, 1997).

**Language Choice in Role-Play and Socialization**

According to Reyes (2004) research on children’s code-switching has shown that simultaneous bilinguals develop knowledge on how and when to use their two languages depending on the addressee, the topic of the conversation, and the situation. More recently, Genesee, Boivin, and Nicoladis (1996) found that French–English bilinguals as young as 2 years of age develop the ability to use and adjust each of their languages differentially and appropriately with parents and an unfamiliar interlocutor as part of their communicative competence. Genesee et al. go further to state that “true bilingual communicative competence entails the ability to adapt one’s language use on-line in accordance with relevant characteristics of the situation, including the preferred or more proficient language of one’s interlocutor” (Genesee, et al., 1996, p.174).

As stated by Wardhaugh (2006) most linguists agree with the fact that the knowledge the speakers have of the language or languages they practice is abstract. It is knowledge of the rules and principles and of the ways of saying and doing things with sounds words and sentences, rather than just awareness of specific sounds, words, and sentences. Communication between people who speak the same language is possible because they share such knowledge, although how it is shared and how it is acquired is not well understood. When two or more people communicate with each other in a speech we call the system of communication that they employ a code or language (Wardhaugh, 2006). Some examples of the way people use language are the
following: People use language to interact with each other, to communicate with others, to ask for something, and to express their feelings.

Children differentiate roles using language features that indicate significant characteristics of the ways individuals speak. In a study of bilingual children, Halmari and Smith (1994) found that children enacted imaginary characters in English (L2), but used their first language (Arabic) for running commentary on the play or for negotiating play frames. Kwan-Terry (1992) credit this to English being the language the child acquaints with “the world at large”. On the other hand, Halmari & Smith (1994, p.431), propose that code-switching acts with other elements, such as tense changes and use of imperatives, to indicate a shift between two “sub-registers” in play: “in-character play” and “negotiation of the play”. Therefore, language is a crucial resource used by children to enact as well as to signal particular social roles in play.

In Ochs’s (1996), study, children in Dominica also engage in complex code-switching practices between English and Patwa in their role play with peers. Their language choice in role enactment illustrates their emerging sensitivity to the ways in which these contrasting languages index particular social identities, places, and activities. Children are viewed as active agents in both reproducing and subtly changing linguistic practices and ideologies through the mutually occurring processes of sociocultural and linguistic learning (Ochs, 1996).

Language socialization research maintains that children are socialized through language as they are socialized to use language (Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004). Therefore, through communication with more knowledgeable members such as adults and older children, children learn and are socialized to learn the cultural and linguistic comprehension required to participate
in everyday social activities and interactions, including philosophy about class, status, race, ethnicity, gender, morality, and language itself.

Conversation constitutes a major part of human interaction. It is through language and conversation that children begin to communicate information through a variety of speech registers and style switching. Of particular interest to sociolinguistic and developmental researchers is the impressive ability of bilingual speakers to switch with ease at different points in conversation. From the sociolinguist’s point of view, code switching is studied to understand why people who are competent in two languages alternate languages in a particular conversation or situation (Reyes, 2004).

According to Cromdal (2004a), work on preference structures shows that dispreferred actions, such as responsive turns that decline or otherwise oppose previous initiatives (e.g., assessments, invitations and requests), tend to be produced in a less straightforward way by means of pausing, postposition, and other techniques than are preferred responses. Drawing on the notion of preference structures, Auer (1984) demonstrated that young bilinguals make use of code-switching to contextualized is preferred actions. Thus, children were shown to code-switch to English in Cantonese conversations with adults when opposing requests and offers (Li, 1998). Somewhat similar findings were reported in Auer's (1984) work on conversations among Italian- and German-speaking adolescents. One might argue, however, that preference features found in adult-adult, adult-child, and adolescent-adolescent conversations are of limited applicability to child-child interactions especially considering the key findings of some important work on monolingual children's disputes.

Myers-Scotton (1988, p.178) emphasizes the dynamics between “a normative framework” and “individual choices”. Code-switching in her sense are linguistic choices as
“negotiations” of personal rights and obligations relative to those of other participants in a talk exchange. She distinguishes between unmarked and marked language choice. The unmarked choice depends on a rights and obligations set associated with a particular conversationalized exchange. Both approaches distinguish between two kinds of switching, one which the immediate, personally motivated communicative intent is the most salient determiner of the switch, and one in which an existing set of conversations is the more salient determiner.

Cultural Borrowing

According to Rouchdy (2002), whenever languages are in contact with one another three linguistic phenomena occur: code-switching, borrowing and interference. Code-switching occurs in the speech of competent bilingual speakers when both speaker and listener know the two languages involved well enough to differentiate items from either language at any moment during their speech. The speakers when code-switching alternate their use of the two languages within a single sentence or more. Borrowing, on the other hand, involves the transfer of lexical items from one language to another, not the alternating use of two languages. The borrowed items are either unchanged or inflected like words of the same grammatical category in the borrowing language. The speaker is not necessarily a competent bilingual. The speaker borrows from the socially dominant language and not from the language he/she knows best. Interference occurs when grammatical rules of the dominant language affect grammatical rules of the subordinate, or borrowing language (Rouchdy, 2002, p.136).

Cultural borrowings are words that fill gaps in the recipients’ language’s store of words because they stand for objects or concepts new to the language culture. Perhaps the most common cultural borrowings around the world are versions of the English word Automobile or
car because most cultures did not have such motorized vehicles before contact with the Western cultures.

The question of distinguishing between code-switching and borrowing is an interesting and important one in itself. Although Gumperz and Hernandez-Chavez (1975, p.158) speak of code-switching even that involving whole sentences as a type of borrowing, the two terms are usually construed as making different claims about the competence of the individual speaker. 'Borrowing' may occur in the speech of those with only monolingual competence, while 'code-switching' implies some degree of competence in two languages. Thus, most investigators (including Gumperz 1976) find it appropriate to distinguish between the two. There has been, however, little agreement as to how the distinction is to be made.

Classification based on the surface syntax and morphology of the particular utterance considered in isolation has been proposed by a number of investigators. Commonly, single words are classified as borrowing rather than switching. Reyes (1974) distinguishes between 'spontaneous borrowings', which are not morphologically adapted to Spanish, and 'incorporated borrowings' which are. Switches, however, are characterized as beginning at 'clearly discernible syntactic junctures' and 'having their own internal syntactic structure'.

According to Pfaff (1979) to determine fully the status of a given word in a second language in a first language utterance, the following questions must be answered: Does the first language equivalent exist? If so, is it also in use in the community? Is the equivalent first language term known to the individual speaker? Does the individual regard the word as belonging to first language or to the second language? Clearly, definitive answers to these questions can be found only through extensive studies of languages in use in the community, on the one hand, and by psycholinguistic probing of individuals, on the other. However, there are
often cues in the utterances themselves which indicate the speaker's perception of the foreignness of a word. Cues at the immediate point of language mixing include hesitation, asides, and translation or paraphrase.

McClure & McClure (1975), handle the classification problem more successfully. They use 'code-switching' as a cover term for 'code-mixing' and 'code-changing', defined both socially and syntactically. Code-mixing, they claim, occurs because an L2 word or expression is more salient or unknown in L1, the language of discourse; it takes place within constituent boundaries, and results in sentences which belong fundamentally to L1. Code-changing, however, is principally a stylistic device denoting change in affect, addressee, mode and the like; it must take place between constituent boundaries, and results in sentences which are sequentially L1 and L2. Though code-mixing and code-changing are theoretically distinct, in practice they are often interrelated, so that code-mixes trigger more extensive code-changes (Pfaff, 1979).

According to Deuchar, different views are held by Poplack and Myers-Scotton regarding the proper scope of a theory of code-switching (Poplack & Meechan, 1998 & Myers-Scotton, 2002). Most linguists agree that a distinction should be drawn between code-switching and borrowing in classifying items from a donor-language that are used in an utterance with otherwise ‘recipient language’ items. A practical reason for drawing the distinction is that theories of code-switching depend on the possibility of identifying all lexical items as belonging to one of two languages, so that ‘switches’ from one language to the other can be identified. Another reason for insisting on this distinction is the assumption that whereas borrowed items may be part of the established lexicon of the recipient language, switched items may be being drawn from the lexicon of the donor language. If this assumption is correct, then we might expect the two classes of item to behave differently. In Poplack’s theory of code-switching,
chunks of donor-language items are unproblematic examples of switches. However, Deuchar mentions that it is the single donor-language items which she considers to be superficially ambiguous between switches and borrowings, and in order to disambiguate the status of these items she defines borrowings as those donor-language items which pattern according to the grammar of the recipient language. Switches, in contrast, are defined as those donor-language items which pattern according to the grammar of the donor language, or in other words, are linguistically integrated in the donor language. Having identified the units of analysis for her theory, she then sets out to test the hypothesis that single donor-language items are much more likely to be borrowings than switches. Now if we compare Poplack’s theory with Myers-Scotton’s, the problem of incommensurability arises both because Myers-Scotton’s definition of switches versus borrowing differs from Poplack’s, and because Myers-Scotton sets out to test a different hypothesis regarding these units of analysis. Myers-Scotton’s definition of switches, as opposed to borrowings is not a categorical one, as is Poplack’s, since Myers-Scotton views each as placed at the opposite ends of a continuum based on frequency of use. Borrowings are highly frequent items while switches are relatively infrequent, although the dividing line between the two is arbitrary. Myers-Scotton agrees with Poplack that borrowings may differ from switches in terms of their degree of integration in the recipient language, but this is a hypothesis for her rather than a way of defining the difference between the two categories (Deuchar).

Social Identity and Language Alteration

A number of ethnomethodologically inspired studies (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998) have been concerned with the notion of social identity and the work it accomplishes in monolingual talk in interaction. In these studies, social identity is understood as "something that is used in talk: something that is part and parcel of the routines of everyday life, brought off in the fine
detail of everyday interaction" (Antaki & Widdicombe 1998, p. 1). As these studies demonstrate, social identity pervades practical social action. On the other hand, studies in bilingual conversation (Auer, 1995 & Gafaranga, 2000) reveal that language alteration, among bilingual speakers itself is practical social action; it is an activity that speakers accomplish while talking. Put together, these developments allow us to raise the issue of the relationship between social identity and language alternation. One of the most popular approaches to language choice and language alternation among bilingual speakers proposes an identity related account (Sebba & Wootton, 1998). Zimmerman (1998) states that starting from the observation that, in bilingual communities, languages are associated with different" transportable identities" such as ethnic, regional, national, and educated identities, and with differential social values, researchers claim that bilingual speakers actively draw on that association when accomplishing the practical task of talking. As consequence, an underlying assumption is that the meaning of specific instances of language alternation is a reflection of those identities and social values. Some key notions in this "identity-related explanation" of language alternation are we/they code (Gumperz 1982) and markedness metric (Myers-Scotton 1993). However, concern has been expressed about the adequacy of this approach as a way of accounting for specific instances of language alternation. Gumperz (1982) stated that "the association between communicative style and group identity is a symbolic one and does not directly predict actual usage" (p. 66). More recently, authors such as Sebba & Wootton (1998) and Li (1998) warn researchers against importing their knowledge of society in to the interpretation of specific instances of language alternation. As these researchers argue, the relationship between language choice and the social values associated with particular languages cannot be taken for granted. For example, in their study of language choice among adolescents of Caribbean origin in London, Sebba & Wootton (1998) demonstrate that either
Jamaican Creole or London English can function as a we-code, depending on the occasion. Even more string in this respect is the evidence from Joergensen (1998). Studying language alternation among children of Turkish origin in Denmark, the author concludes that, among these children, Danish-Turkish language alternation itself is sometimes the we-code. The observations warrant an alternative account of language alternation in terms of speakers' social identities.

Studies in bilingual conversation by Auer (1995) and Gafaranga (2000) reveal that language alternation among bilingual speakers itself is a practical social action is an activity that speakers accomplish while talking. Put together, these developments allow us to raise the issue of the relationship between social identity and language alternation. One of the most popular approaches to language choice and language alternation among bilingual speakers proposes an identity related account. Classic studies in this perspective include Gumperz (1982) and Myers-Scotton (1993a). Starting from the observation that, in bilingual communities, languages are associated with different "transportable identities" (Zimmerman, 1998) such as ethnic, regional, national, and educated identities, and with differential social values, researchers claim that bilingual speakers actively draw on that association when accomplishing the practical task of talking. As consequence, an underlying assumption is that the meaning of specific instances of language alternation is a reflection of those identities and social values. Some key notions in this "identity-related explanation" of language alternation are we/they code (Gumperz, 1982) and markedness metric (Myers-Scotton, 1993a).

As indicated by Myers-Scotton (2004, p.234) when speakers regularly use two or more languages in their daily interactions, there can be a number of different outcomes affecting the grammars of those languages. These are called language contact phenomena. These phenomena come in many different forms, but they all have to do with either (1) How the
elements of two language varieties are used together in some way or (2) How the grammar of one variety affects the grammar of another. Both languages do not participate equally in resulting structures. That is, almost always, one language supplies the main grammatical frame for a clause containing words from two or more languages.

Research by Duran (1994) shows that several factors influence the comprehension of code-switched words. Bilinguals tend to comprehend code-switched words faster when there is a phonological overlap between the two languages. Other factors include context, phonetics, words pronounced the same (homophonic), and words spelled the same (homographic). Other research by Sert (2005) indicates that language dominance, which language is used more frequently, is important in code-switching. It is shown in Duran’s (1994) study that the Spanish-English speaking bilinguals use code-switching more when they have conversations in Spanish than when they do in English. Evidence also suggests that bilinguals retrieve English code-switched words faster when they listen to Spanish sentences, and are slower to retrieve Spanish code-switched words in English sentences. Code-switched words may be retrieved faster than monolingual words, but only if the code switched word is in English, and the language of communication is Spanish. This suggests a reliance on a bilingual’s second language rather than the first. The idea behind this view is that a language shift occurs where the second language behaves as if it were the first language, after a certain level of fluency and frequent use has occurred. The second language becomes more accessible and bilinguals tend to rely on it more (Duran, 1994).

Second Language Acquisition

There is some concern by researchers, such as Deiner (2010) that young children do not understand that they are learning two languages. This is especially true when they code-switch
or mix two languages. As children are learning two languages, there may be words they know in one language but not the other. It is natural for them to use words they know from both languages, this phenomena is called code-switching. However, their switches are grammatically correct. Think about your language. What if you wanted to use the word “simultaneous” but you couldn’t think of the word so you said “at the same time”. That is how young children code-switch. They use a word they know in one language to substitute for a word they don’t know in the other. As their vocabulary grows this becomes less frequent (Deiner, 2010). As teachers and parents are trying to talk with children, they should include a language rich environment with words they want the children to learn. Carrera-Carrillo and Smith (2006) identify five stages in this developmental process.

1. **Production**: As with first language acquisition when children start the second language learning process they understand few words and may have no verbalization. To show they understand they do such things as nod or shake their head, point to objects or categorize them. Children need a language rich environment, including many different and varied learning and listening opportunities with an emphasis on physical movement, art and music.

2. **Early Production**: Children have limited comprehension and can use one and two word responses. They can identify people, places, and things, and can also repeat some language. Context helps children understand the meaning of language. This is the time to ask who, what, where questions, give either-or choices, and ask yes-or-no questions. Teachers and parents should encourage children to label and actively manipulate objects.

3. **Speech Emergence**: Children at this stage have good comprehension and can make simple sentences that may have errors but are understandable. This is the time to have
children build vocabulary, define new words, and describe people places, and events. Teachers may encourage children to retell information in their own words. Teachers should ask open-ended questions as well as modeling, restating, enriching, and expanding children’s language.

4. **Intermediate Fluency:** Children at this stage have excellent comprehension and few grammatical errors. They can express and defend views, behaviours, and actions. They can negotiate with others and give their own opinions. Teachers at this stage can provide children with more complex language.

5. **Advanced Fluency:** Children have oral and written language comparable to native English speakers of the same age.

People have many questions about very young children’s’ second language acquisition. The first theme is differentiating the two languages. Is it possible for the child to speak both languages well, but keep them both separate? When these bilingual children speak, do they just speak whatever comes out first, or do they mix languages, or what? The second theme concerns the age of acquisition. Is there a cut-off point in language acquisition so that second language learning is more difficult after a certain age (Myers-Scotton 2004, p.325)? Many readers who come from largely monolingual societies or societies where second languages are usually learned only in school look upon very young children who speak two or more languages as linguistic marvels. We sometimes think that these children must be super intelligent to “master” speaking two languages before they can tie their shoes or ride a bicycle. But these little bilinguals are not linguistic wizards; they are simply doing what children of normal intelligence can do (Myers-Scotton 2004, p.325).
Myers-Scotton (2004, p.326) brings up the question of whether small children need actual exposure to a language in use in order to develop a linguistic system. The assumed answer is “yes”. But how important the extent and quality of exposure remains a question, but clearly exposure is vital.

Krashen's (1977) Monitor Model and accompanying theory have had the most powerful impact to date on second language acquisition research and on second language teaching. The Monitor Model, which is linked in more recent form with Dulay and Burt's (1977) Affective Filter Hypothesis, provides a persuasive scheme of processes and activities in second language learning. Krashen's theory rests on several fundamental principles:

1. Acquisition and learning are technical terms representing separate phenomena. Acquisition is motivated by a focus on communication and is not conscious; learning is motivated by a focus on form, is conscious, and results in metalinguistic knowledge.

2. In speech production, acquired and learned forms are generated separately, with monitoring and conscious attention to performance often modifying output; the amount of monitoring is a variable. The Monitor, as presented by its proponents, is an output component and has no effect on acquisition.

3. The conditions for optimal Monitor use are a focus on form, sufficient time, and knowledge of a pertinent rule.

4. The Monitor can be overused or misused, resulting in hesitant and/or deficient target language production.

5. In decoding second language input, affective variables can impede acquisition and learning. This phenomenon is represented schematically by an Affective Filter.
Recent work by Krashen and others incorporates extensive observations on and recommendations for language teaching and the treatment of errors. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) elaborate on implications of the theory. The strong reception accorded to Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's work has resulted from the fact that their ideas are systematically elaborated and that they fit with second language experiences that learners undergo, such as the frustration that occurs when conscious output processing (monitoring) is inhibitive. Too much attention to form can result in an inability to communicate.

Various studies have reported that young children of preschool and primary school age are relatively ineffective communicators but that they improve as they grow older (Flavell, Botkin, Fry, Wright, & Jarvis 1968). Piaget (1971) claimed that young children's verbal messages are neither informative nor communicative because the child does not intend them to be, nor does he possess the linguistic or cognitive skills to make them so. Vygotsky (1962), on the other hand, claims that child speech is essentially communicative, but it is not "social" and, therefore, not informative because the child does not differentiate between himself as listener and the other person as listener. Thus, his messages are directed more to himself than to the listener. Much of this theory and research belies the actual complexity of the communicative skills of young children in interpersonal situations. Shatz and Gelman (1973) found that 4-year-old children adjust their speech style when talking to adult listeners in contrast to younger children (2-year-olds). Similarly, Genesse, Tucker and Lambert (1973) found that pre-schoolers were more explicit when describing a visual display to listeners who were blind-folded than when describing the same display to listeners who could see. Furthermore, Garvey and Hogan (1973) found that preschoolers spent a considerable amount of time during a free-play situation engaged in genuinely social interaction including talk. Effective verbal communication presumably
depends upon the child being sensitive to or aware of his listener's needs and characteristics such as age, intelligence or linguistic skills.

It has been claimed by Genesee, Nicoladis and Paradis (1995) that children simultaneously acquiring two languages go through an initial stage when they are unable to differentiate between their two languages. Such claims have been based on the observation that at times virtually all bilingual children mix elements (e.g. lexical, morphological) from their two languages in the same utterance. That most, if not all, children acquiring two languages simultaneously mix linguistic elements in this way is widely documented. Although such code-mixing is not well understood or explained, there are a number of explanations unrelated to lack of language differentiation that may explain it. Moreover, while language differentiation is widely attested among bilingual children once functional categories emerge, usually during the third year, there is still some question as to how early in development differentiation is present (Genesee, et al., 1995).

One of the main objectives of theories of second-language acquisition is to count for the manner and order in which a second language is acquired and develop an explanation that is applicable across language-specific boundaries regardless of the learner’s first language. Most current theories of second-language acquisition assume that the learner’s native language plays a role in the acquisition; however, what role the native language plays is something less certain and controversial. Some researchers are of the view that speakers of first language are initially transferred to the interlanguage grammar, but given the appropriate input will ultimately be adjusted to the correct L2 setting. On the other hand, other researchers believe that L1 serves as a “surrogate” Universal Grammar for the learner and that only those aspects of universal
grammar that are manifested in the native language will be acquired by the learner (Kasem, 2000, p.179).

*Functions of Code-Switching*

The functions of code-switching have been studied extensively by Gumperz (1982), Heller (1988), Myers-Scotton (1993a), among others. Research in this area has focused on specific functions in a given community. However, it is only in the past twenty five years or so that classroom-based code-switching studies have developed, and ultimately a body of research has emerged, including Moore (2002), Cook (2001), Sert (2005), Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain (2005), and Zabrodskaja (2007). These researchers have looked at the processes of switching languages in the classroom context. In their study of code switching in foreign language classroom, Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain (2005), "found that students code-switch not only as a fallback method when their knowledge of a second language fails them, or for other participant-related functions, but also for discourse-related functions that contextualize the interactional meaning of their utterances"(p.234). This strategy, however, is not only used in teaching/learning foreign or second languages, but is also common in classroom contexts where a foreign or second language is employed as a medium of instruction for other subjects as the present study shows. The alternation of languages in the classroom, whether in second or foreign language teaching/learning situations or in teaching other subjects across curriculum, appears to be a wide spread practice, particularly in multilingual classrooms in contact language situations. In fact some researchers such as Zabrodskaja (2007) and Sert (2005) have even gone further to suggest that "code switching can be exploited as part of actual teaching-methodology" (Zabrodskaja, 2007, p. 124).
The functions of teacher code switching are known as topic switch, affective functions, and repetitive functions. In topic switching, the teacher alters his or her language according to the topic being taught. This is mainly seen in grammar instruction, and the student’s attention is directed towards the new knowledge. Affective functions are important in the expression of emotions, and building a relationship between the teacher and the student. In repetitive functions, code switching is used to clarify the meaning of a word, and stresses importance on the foreign language content for better comprehension (Sert, 2005).

As mentioned in Sert’s study (2005), students 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 (1996) names these functions as: equivalence, floor-holding, reiteration, and conflict control.

The first function of student code-switch is equivalence. In this case, the students make use of the native equivalent of a certain lexical item in target language and therefore code-switch to their 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 they do not have the competence for using the target language explanation for a particular lexical item. So “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 (Sert, 2005).

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 performing code-switching for floor holding
generally have the same problem: they cannot recall the 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, which is pointed by Eldridge (1996) as: “messages are reinforced, emphasized, or clarified where the message has already been transmitted in one code, but not understood” (p. 306). 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 have two reasons: first, the student 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 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 and may result in code-switching for conflict control; therefore possible misunderstandings are avoided (Eldridge, 1996, p.306).

The premise underlying Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model for the social motivations for code-switching is that speakers use the possibility of making code choices to negotiate interpersonal relationships, and by extension to signal their perceptions or desires about group
memberships. Myers-Scotton (1993b) proposes that this comes about because speakers possess a "Negotiation Principle". This principle is an analogue to the "Cooperation Principle" of Grice (1975) in its structure, but not its force. Grice's premise is that participants in a conversation can count on their fellows to cooperate in structuring their utterances by following a set of maxims (or by patently exploiting them) so that their intended implications are clear. The Negotiation Principle and its maxims, however, refer to strategies of negotiation which are necessarily as likely to engender conflict as cooperation. This principle articulates one of the Markedness Model's premises: that humans are innately predisposed to exploit code choices as negotiations of "position." That is, speakers use their linguistic choices as tools to index for others their perceptions of self, and of rights and obligations holding between self and others. In turn, as in any negotiation, others can agree with or dispute the socio-pragmatic goals of such linguistic moves. A second premise of the model is that speakers pay attention to the relative markedness of code choices. Myers-Scotton (1993a) argues that all speakers have a natural (i.e. innate) theory of markedness and indexicality, including a "markedness metric": This predisposes speakers, for specific interactions in their community, to assign readings of markedness to codes in the community's linguistic repertoire. Speakers actually make these assignments only by experiencing language in use in their community; in this way, they develop a sense of which code is more unmarked (i.e. expected) for interaction. The speaker's own markedness model has two parts. First, there is its universal aspect: the capacity for speakers to interpret linguistic choices as marked or unmarked for a given interaction in a cognitive structure, and therefore universal. Second, there is the community-specific aspect: Speakers use a "generic" markedness metric to make calculations (i.e. which codes are more or less unmarked for a given interaction); but such computations require an input exposure to language in use in their social groups. How
speakers exploit the content in their markedness metric also has two parts. First, the labeling of choices as marked or not implies that they take place in a normative framework. Their markedness represents community consensus (or, for certain interaction types, the norm of those having power and prestige - a norm which other groups recognize, whether they approve of it or not). Second, although speakers must acknowledge the normative framework, they make their own decisions; they enact their roles as goal-oriented actors however they like. They weigh relative costs and rewards of choices in seeking a good outcome (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). But while they are free to enact any negotiation (by using the code choice indexing that negotiation), the way that their choices will be interpreted is not free. The result is that choices are motivated not by norms themselves, but rather by individual perceptions of social consequences. The Markedness Model thus offers a motivation for the typical distribution of code choices in a given interaction type.

Considering code-switching in general, the pole "absence of code switching" may be classified as the unmarked pole due to its greater freedom of occurrence, its simplicity—since only one linguistic code is involved—and the semantic indeterminacy of its use. But at this point a very important distinction must be made: the distinction between what are the general markedness values (the values that categories exhibit in general in a language) and the local markedness values, which are reversals of the general markedness and can be characterized by aspects of real-world context. According to Battistella (1990), reversals occur when "for biological, cultural or social reasons, some feature becomes dominant in a certain context" (p. 60). For example, the markedness values have been reversed in the pair nurse/male nurse, where the feminine is the unmarked term contrary to the general rule. This reversal takes place because in the context of the real world this has been a profession traditionally occupied by women. Male nurse is formed
then, based on the unmarked term, and therefore represents the marked pole. Batistella (1990) mentions that in a very broad sense one can say that bicultural and bilingual communities represent that "real world context" that makes more typical the term otherwise marked: while code-switching among non-bilingual members of a community has a marked value, among those who live with two cultures and languages it becomes an unmarked choice. But just as cultural importance can reverse markedness values, linguistic and sociolinguistic contexts may also affect the distribution of marked and unmarked units. In the patterns of conversational use of code-switching one can easily observe a correspondence between the markedness of the style of speech: formal versus informal, or the social identity of the audience: in-group member versus no in-group member, and the markedness value assigned to the presence of code-switching. Myers-Scotton (1993 b) mentions that when the markeness model is used among bilingual peers in informal settings, code-switching represents the unmarked choice: in these kinds of interactions it is the expected, normal choice. Conversely, code-switching is a marked choice when used in a formal context or when communication is established with a non in-group member of the community, even if of Hispanic origin as well. The Markedness model accounts for the socio-psychological motivations of speakers when they engage in code-switching. Linguistic choices are seen as more than skilled performance; they are considered a strategy for accomplishing something. In this way, speakers are creative actors who manage communicative skills according to what they want to accomplish (Myers-Scotton, 1993b).

*Linguistic Insecurity and Topic Switch*

According to Flyman (1997, p.57) there are some differences in the reasons for switching code. In natural speech, in bilinguals as well as monolinguals, linguistic insecurity in the speaker may constitute a possible cause for switching into the code that is the most comfortable for the
speaker. In the case of bilinguals, the two languages are often made use of in different situations, such as formal versus informal situations, and consequently some words are more stable in one language. However, linguistic insecurity in classroom interaction is a more complicated matter. In students’ speech it is not uncommon; code-switching is one of the most frequent communication strategies used by foreign language students (Flyman 1997, p.57). In teachers’ speech the situation is somewhat different. Since the task of the teacher is to transmit knowledge of a foreign language to the students, it is not appropriate to use words for which the teacher will have to switch code to be able to control. This might damage the students’ confidence in the teacher’s proficiency of the foreign language. A possible solution for the teacher might, therefore, be to avoid words they do not control or quite simply restructure the utterance (Flyman & Burenhult 1999). As indicated by Flyman & Burenhult (1999) on the other hand, code-switching at topic switch seems to be a relatively frequent phenomenon in the classroom. Grammar instruction is usually carried out in the students’ mother tongue, while conversation, in a majority of the cases, is performed in the target language. A probable explanation for this is the fact that the proficiency of the students is not developed enough to include terms necessary in grammar instruction. Following the traditional teaching methods still widely spread in Sweden, teachers believe that the first language is a necessary means of explaining rules and structures of the foreign language.

Linguistic Factors of Code-Switching

Studies on code-switching have blossomed in recent years, the bulk of them concentrating on social and functional factors that operate to constrain it (Gumperz 1976). However, a growing number of code-switching studies have dealt with the linguistic factors that
come into play (Gumperz 1976). From a number of studies, three general linguistic constraints have emerged. They have been explained as follows. The equivalence of structure constraint, or equivalence constraint, as Poplack (1980) has called it, can be stated most simply in this way: "Surface structures common to both languages are favored for switches" (p.586). He has been the most comprehensive in elaborating on the constraint: Code-switches will tend to occur at points in discourse where juxtaposition of first language and second language elements does not violate a syntactic rule of either language, for example: at points around which the surface structures of the two languages map onto each other. According to this simple constraint, a switch is inhibited from occurring within a constituent generated by a rule from one language which is not shared by the other. Lipski (1978) specifies the equivalence constraint even further: "Whereas, the portion of the code-switched utterance that falls before the code-switch may indeed contain syntactically divergent elements, those portions falling after the switch must be essentially identical syntactically‖ (p. 258). The size-of-constituent constraint says that higher-level constituents, that is major constituents (e.g., sentences, clauses) tend to be switched more frequently than lower-level constituents, or smaller ones (i.e., one-word categories such as nouns, determiners, verbs, adverbs, adjectives) (Poplack, I980). This constraint, in turn, derives from the more general constraint which says that code-switches occur primarily at phrase structure boundaries (Poplack, 1980). The one regularly found exception to the size-of-constituent constraint is the category noun. Below the level of the sentence, nouns consistently have been found to comprise the greatest number of switches (Poplack,1980).

The size-of-constitutent constraint has important ramifications for theories of bilingualism, in that size of constituent repeatedly has been found to be correlated with the bilingual ability of the speaker. Studies of child bilingual language acquisition (McClure 1981)
and adult bilingualism (Pfaff, 1979) consistently have shown that frequent intrasentential code-switching is associated with high bilingual ability, whereas use of intersentential switching is associated with non-fluency or dominance in one language over the other. These findings, in turn, have led some scholars such as Poplack (1980) to the conclusion that the ability to code-switch intrasententially may be used as a measure of bilingual competence. The third linguistic constraint on code-switching, the free morpheme constraint, has been confirmed by a number of studies (Pfaff, 1979; Poplack, 1980). It states, in short, that code-switching is prohibited between a free and a bound morpheme, or in Poplack's (1980, p.585-586) terms, "Codes may be switched after any constituent in discourse provided that constituent is not a bound morpheme." This would mean, for example, that an item such as EAT-iendo 'eating', which consists of a Spanish bound morpheme iendo '-ing' affixed onto an English root, 'eat', could not occur in the speech of a Spanish/English bilingual, and has never been attested, "unless one of the morphemes has been integrated phonologically into the language of the other" (Poplack 1980, p.586), that is, unless the word had attained the status of a borrowing. Scholars have characterized this constraint somewhat more narrowly in their statement that, "no words with morphology from both languages can exist without first having the stem integrated into the language of the suffix phonologically and semantically." Poplack (1980, p.586) extends the jurisdiction of the free morpheme constraint to cover idiomatic expressions and frozen forms (e.g., "cross my fingers and hope to die," "si Dios quiere y la virgen" [God and the virgin willing]). In actuality, all of these definitions are somewhat too narrow, in that they allow for the possibility of switching between a bound and a free morpheme (e.g., between a prefix and a stem). Thus, the free morpheme constraint would best be defined as the impossibility of code-switching at a point of morpheme binding.
The acceptance of the above three constraints has led Poplack (1980) to the conclusion that, "code-switching is itself a discrete mode of speaking, possibly emanating from a single code-switching grammar composed of the overlap-ping sectors of the grammars of first language, and second language…," (p. 615) and that "the outer areas where there is no equivalence will tend to be reserved for monolingual segments of discourse" (Poplack 1981, p.183).

Conclusion

In conclusion based on the literature review, it was found that different people have a unique way of using language. Their choice to use language is part of the social identity they claim themselves to be. There are different reasons bilingual speakers may choose to code-switch and these reasons include, solidarity, choice of topic, accommodation to speakers and perceived social cultural distance. For many speakers of the same language it seems that they are not aware that they code-switch and this process happens unconsciously. On the other hand some bilingual speakers may choose to code-switch in order to make themselves understood. As a consequence, preschool is a very important phase where children learn a language and therefore they must receive the necessary instruction in order to help these children master a certain language.
CHAPTER 3

This chapter exhibits the different methods used to collect data as well as the reasons for utilizing each. Furthermore, this chapter introduces the way the data collected were analyzed, the participants who took part in the research and it also highlights the strengths and weaknesses of observation and interviews.

Methodology

This study is exploratory by nature. It is a small-scale exploratory case study conducted in eight classrooms in the Early Years section. Exploratory research is concerned with why phenomena occur and the forces and influences that drive their occurrence. Because of its facility to examine the subjects in-depth, qualitative research provides a unique toll for studying what lies behind, or underpins, a decision, attitude, behaviour or other phenomena (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003). It also allows associations that occur in people’s thinking or acting and the meaning these have for people. Observation and documentation of students’ dialogue and remarks will be carried out in the observers’ classroom, in seven other classes and in the playground during recess. Two instruments will be used to explore the issue of code-switching in the Early Years classrooms:

1. Participant observations: Observation of students in different classes and documenting their dialogue.

2. Teacher interview: Interviews will be conducted with five teachers in the Early Years department.
**Observation**

As stated by Ritchie and Lewis (2003) observation is a very effective tool used to find out what people do in particular contexts, the routines and interactional patterns of their everyday lives. In the human services, observational research methods can provide an understanding of what is happening in the encounter between a service provider and use, or within a family, a committee, a ward or residential unit, a large organization or a community (p.74). Classroom observation was selected as a method to collect data since it allowed me to observe the students in their natural setting, conversing and interacting freely. O’Donnell and Wood (2004, p.292) refer to this kind of observation as “naturalistic assessment” which involves observing the children’s engagement in a variety of situations and noting how they approach various tasks and perform in different situations.

The classic form of data collection in naturalistic or field research is observation of participants in the context of a natural scene. Observational data are used for the purpose of description—of settings, activities, people, and the meanings of what is observed from the perspective of the participants. Observation can lead to deeper understandings than interviews alone, because it provides knowledge of the context in which events occur, and may enable the researcher to see things that participants themselves are not aware of, or that they are unwilling to discuss (Patton, 1990). A skilled observer is one who is trained in the process of monitoring both verbal and nonverbal cues, and in the use of concrete, unambiguous, descriptive language.

**Strengths and Limitation of Observation**

As indicated by Darlington and Scott (2003, p.75) observation has its strengths and limitations. Observations allow access to events as they happen. They also require little active
effort on the part of those being observed. Observation takes place at the same time as an activity that would be happening anyway. On the other hand, the observer is limited to observable social phenomena. Internal processes of cognition and emotion cannot be observed. Observation alone cannot tell us why people do the things they do or what particular activity means to them. As observation can assist in understanding events as they take place, events that have already occurred or that have not yet happened cannot be observed. People who know they are being watched may change their behaviour in all sorts of ways, both consciously and unconsciously (Darlington & Scott, 2002). In the school where this study is conducted the children’s behaviours might not change since the children are already used to having teachers around with cameras, note pads and pens.

*Interviews*

Qualitative interviewing utilizes open-ended questions that allow for individual variations. Patton (1990) writes about three types of qualitative interviewing: 1) informal, conversational interviews; 2) semi-structured interviews; and 3) standardized, open-ended interviews. An interview guide or “schedule” is a list of questions or general topics that the interviewer wants to explore during each interview. Although it is prepared to insure that basically the same information is obtained from each person, there are no predetermined responses, and in semi-structured interviews the interviewer is free to probe and explore within these predetermined inquiry areas. Interview guides ensure good use of limited interview time; they make interviewing multiple subjects more systematic and comprehensive; and they help to keep interactions focused (Hoepfl, 1997).
Strengths and Limitation of Interviews

Interviews like any other data collection method have their strengths and weaknesses. As indicated by Darlington and Scott (2002, p. 48) the choice to use interviews or not must be made in relation to the nature of the data sought and the practical constraints of the research context. The best data collection approach for any study is that which will yield data that best meet the research purpose and answer the research questions. Sometimes interviews will be most appropriate, sometimes observation or the analysis of existing records. In accordance with Ritchie and Lewis’ study (2003), interviews have their strengths. The key feature of interviews is their depth of focus on the individual. They provide an opportunity for detailed investigation of each person’s personal perspective, for in-depth understanding of the personal context within which the research phenomenon is located, and for very detailed subject coverage. They are the only way to collect data where it is important to set the perspectives heard within the context of personal history or experience; where delicate or complex issues need to be explored at a detailed level, or where it is important to relate different issues to individual personal circumstances.

In order to strengthen the finding of this study both observation and interview took place in order to collect data.

Participants

This study was conducted on a group of 20 Early Years children whose age varied between 3-6 years. Most of the participants are from the same nursery class since the researcher works in one of the nursery sections. The selection of students was based on their language competence. Therefore, a variety of children of different language ability will be selected and
included in the observation process for the research project. The participants included will be a group of 11 students who speak English and Arabic, a group of 7 students who speak English, Arabic and French, a child who speaks English, Arabic and Spanish, and a child who speaks English, Arabic and German. English is considered the second or third language of these students. While some of these students are fluent in English some of the other students English varied between low, medium and high. The language level of the students was established at the beginning of the year for the teachers’ personal records.

**Procedures**

Student observations will be conducted on a daily basis throughout the day over a period of 10 weeks from the beginning of September 2010 until the end of November 2010. I will observe the children throughout the day while they interact with one another during free play time in the classroom and during recess in the playground. I will keep a diary of my observations while children interact with one another. I will record the children’s dialogues when code-switching will occur (see appendix A).

**Data collection methods**

**Observation Procedure**

Participant observations will be conducted for an hour every day which will be divided into 15-20 minutes period in 8 different classes. Since the classes are divided into centres and the teachers follow the students’ interest in order to help children learn, it will be easy for the researcher to observe the students without having them realize she is there to document their language, interaction, and dialogue. Since documenting is a big part of the schools’ practice the children in the school are used to having teachers observing and documenting their learning
experiences. Thus, the observation process will not change the children’s behaviours or language competence. Participant observation allows me to have access to situations that would otherwise remain unclear; therefore I will be able to observe, document, and analyse the children’s language competence and interactions.

The children in the class are usually divided into 3 groups with 7-8 children in each group. A diary will be kept and notes are going to be taken of students’ conversation in order for me to keep track of the students’ dialogues, remarks and statements. I will monitor the students in the nursery class as well as observed and keep a record of student observation of different students in other classes during my break. Observation and recording of student observation will be made throughout the school day (see appendix A).

*Interviews Procedure*

In December 2010, interviews will be conducted with 5 teachers (see appendix B). I will take an appointment with each of the teachers in order to conduct the interview. Teachers will be told that interviews will be kept anonymous and if they felt more comfortable they could be interviewed alone in the conference room in the school library. Consent by the participants will be given. The interviewees will have a clear understanding of what the interview will be about. When I conduct the interviews I will direct the interaction and will introduce the research topic. This will involve providing a clear reiteration of the nature and purpose of the research, reaffirming confidentiality, and seek permission to record the interview. The process will also involve making sure that the environment will be suitably quiet, private and comfortable for the interview to proceed without distraction. After the interview finishes I will thank the participant
and reiterated that their participation and contribution will be confidential in the analysis of the research project (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003).

**Ethical Issues**

The principal in the school will be notified about the type and purpose of the study. The teachers whose classroom I will observe will also be notified of the nature and purpose of the study, they will also be told about the frequency of the observations. Teachers will be informed that if they are involved in the study their names will be kept anonymous. Additionally, the name of the school will not be revealed, and the children’s names will be kept anonymous for confidentiality (Seale, Gobo, Gubrium, & Silverman, 2004). Since the study will only consists of student observations in different classes they will not be notified of the nature of the study since they are too young to understand it.

**Data Analysis**

According to Richie and Lewis (2003), there are no clearly agreed rules or procedures for analyzing qualitative data. Approaches to analyse vary in terms of basic epistemological assumptions about the nature of qualitative enquiry and the researcher’s account. Hence, the data analysis falls under Richie and Lewis’ (2003) approach called “discourse analysis”. Discourse analysis is concerned with the way knowledge is produced within a particular discourse through the use of distinctive language.

Darlington and Scott (2002) mention that interviews are particularly useful when the phenomena under investigation cannot be observed directly. Therefore, interviews are an excellent means of finding out how people think or feel about a certain topic. Interviews also
enable us to talk with people about events that happened in the past and those that are yet to happen. They are the only way to find out the persons perception of a certain topic.

According to Richie and Lewis’ (2003) in-depth or unstructured interviews is one of the main methods of data collection used in qualitative research. The in-depth interview is often described as a form of conversation. The researcher took appointments at different times in order to interview five teachers in the Early Years section in school. The researcher directed the interaction by introducing the research topic. This involved providing a clear reiteration of the nature and purpose of the study, reaffirming confidentiality, and seeking permission to record the interview. The researcher also made sure that the environment was quiet, private and comfortable for the interview to proceed without distraction.

Since each person’s perspective and experience will be different, and there is always something new to hear, data collection has to stop somewhere. Where new broad patterns do not appear to be emerging, where interviewees’ perspectives are confirmatory rather than contradictory, it can be safe to stop the interview.

Conclusion

The different aspects for analyzing data were highlighted in this chapter. It was stated that there are strengths and weaknesses for observations and interviews. It is shown that the best way to analyse the questions posed in this research project was to use observations and interviews since observations allows the researcher to observe the students in their natural setting, while conversing and interacting freely with one another. This chapter also presented the fact that interviews are an effective method in order to investigate a persons’ personal perspective on a certain subject. The next chapter will report and discuss the results of the study.
CHAPTER 4

Results and Discussion

A key component in qualitative research such as this study is “coding”. In qualitative research, coding is an integral part of the analysis, involving sifting through the data, making sense of it and categorizing it in various ways (Darlington & Scott 2002, p145). Qualitative research is mainly concerned with identifying patterns in the data; different ways in which the data relate to each other. Therefore, coding was the method used to analyze the data collected through observation. The data gathered from observing the children in different settings in school was through the children’s interaction with one another, dialogues between students and teachers, comments and statements made by the children.

The two data collection tools have offered adequate data to answer the questions posed in this research paper.

Question 1

Who do the students code-switch with?

Observations

The first research question associated with whom the children code-switch with, could be answered through the data collection instruments in this study. The classroom and playground observations revealed that children are most likely to code-switched with each other. Children also switched between English and Arabic with their teachers. This interaction occurred while some children were role-playing in the drama area in the classroom.

Student X: “Mama what we’re gonna do now?”
Student Y: “We’re going to eat.”
Student X: “O.K. yalla lets go.”
Student Y: “Wait, wait, first badna to wash our hands.”

In the dialogue above the children were interacting with each other and therefore, code-switching occurred when the children had difficulty in expressing themselves and saying certain words in English.

Children also tended to code-switch while making remarks on certain issues happening in the classroom. This was revealed in the following comment:

“This has hamoud.”

“I’m not a boy, he’s pushing me shou heida.”

“My daddy went on the tayara.”

“I have inside labneh.”

Code-switching also occurred while a child was conversing with her teacher during Free Play in the classroom. This was revealed in the following dialogue:

Student: “Do you know what this is called?”
Teacher: “Why don’t you tell me?”
Student: “It’s a samaka.”
Teacher: “You mean a fish?”
Student: “Yes, but Ms. X and Ms. Y call it a sammaka.”
Teacher: “That’s because they are your Arabic teachers.”
Student: ”Yes.”
Question 2

In which context do these students code-switch (in the classroom, in the playground, during Arabic/English class etc.)?

The second research question which deals with the context in which the children code-switch could also be answered through the observations made by the researcher.

Observations

It was obvious that the children tended to code-switch while playing with each other in the different centres/areas in the classroom. The children also switched between the English and Arabic language when conversing and communicating with their teachers. In addition, the children code-switched while making remarks and comments about certain incidents that were happening in the classroom. The students code-switched during snack time when talking about the different food they had brought in to school. They used Arabic to name the food since they did not know the word in English or since there was no replacement for it such as manoushe. They tended to code-switch when they had difficulty in finding certain words in English and therefore used the Arabic instead. This was shown in the following statements:

Example 1

“Wallah it’s raining.”

Example 2

Student X: “Look there’s ajine on the table. You want to play with the ajine?”

Student Y: “Ajine?”

Student X: “Yeah.”
Student Y: “Look what we have on the table. X tell her.”
Student X: “It’s ajine, we’re playing with it.”

Example 3

“My mum wears like this, like hajjeh.”

Example 4

Student X: “Look Ms. X, she has a chocolate croissant.”
Student Y: “No, mush chocolate, it’s zaatar.”

“Me, I like batata, nuggets, and ketchup.”

Example 5

Student X: “Look Ms. X, she has a chocolate croissant.”
Student Y: “No, mush chocolate, it’s zaatar.”

Teacher: “What did you have for lunch yesterday?”
Student: “Yesterday I ate kibbeh.”

The children appeared to be code-switching in the classroom while playing in different centres, in the playground with their friends, during P.E., during recess, and during Arabic. While the children role played in the drama centre, they were more likely to speak in Arabic when dividing their roles, but as their role play started the children shifted from Arabic to English. When the students were pretending to be their parents or a relative they used the Arabic language to communicate with each other. The same words and tone of voice their family
members used were also used by the children while role playing. Examples of the children code-switching in the playground, during Arabic class and P.E. are displayed below:

**Example 1**

**Student X:** “I’m dizzy.”

**Student Y:** “I’m dizzy too.”

**Student Z:** “I’m not dizzy hamdillah.”

**Example 2**

“Hala bado ijib cake baba.”

**Example 3**

“Ya allah I fell.”

**Question 3**

**Why do these students code-switch with these particular people?**

The third research question could be answered through the researchers’ observations and questionnaires that were distributed to the teachers.

**Observations**

During the researchers’ observations in this research question, it was shown that children tended to code-switch with particular people because they seemed to be comfortable with them. Some students were apt to code-switch with particular children because they had difficulty speaking in English with most children and therefore, knew that certain students were able to speak Arabic and thus, found that communication was easier with those certain children. The
children that were code-switching spoke in both languages to certain students since they knew that these students were bilingual and thus, spoke both English and Arabic. Therefore, these children did not hesitate to use the Arabic instead of the English. On the other hand, the same students knew not to speak Arabic with certain children since they knew they were monolingual, and therefore found it hard at times to say certain words in English. While some children were conscious in altering their language when speaking with their peers some children’s language alteration was unconscious. It was found by the researcher that it took the children more time to try and retrieve certain words in English. As a result some children appeared to hesitate at times when speaking with monolingual children. Below is an example of two bilingual children code-switching with one another while playing in the drama area:

Student X: “Labsiya tannoura the Iaabe is really cold.”

Student Y: “No, she’s going to have a bath.”

Student X: “Taamiya, she’s hungry.”

Question 4

Why do students code-switch?

The fourth research question could be answered by both the observations and questionnaires that were distributed to the teachers.

Observations

One would expect that code-switching would only take place when the bilingual is speaking a second language. That is, bilinguals would experience more first language interference as they communicate in their second language than second language interference as
they communicate in their first language. This would be because of their limited knowledge of their second language (Heredia & Altarriba 2001).

Throughout the researchers’ observations it was revealed that particular children code-switched because they did not know the replacement of the word in English and therefore used the Arabic language instead. The children also code-switch with certain children because they knew that the children and teachers they were communicating with spoke both English and Arabic. Since the majority of the students in the class were multilinguals it was also obvious that the children did not know either of the languages completely and therefore, they used either French or Arabic to compensate for the English word. Below is an example of students using the word “dough” in Arabic since they did not know the replacement in English:

Example 1

Student X: “Look there’s ajine on the table. You want to play with the ahine?”

Student Y: “Agine?”

Student X: “Yeah.”

Student Y: “Look what we have on the table. X tell her.”

Student X: “It’s agine, we’re playing with it.”

Example 2

Student: “Look Ms. X! Look!”

Teacher: “What is it?”

Student: “It’s a akhtabout. Look the akhtabout has a mouth.”

Example 3

Mohamad: “I know how to do an airplane.”

Majd: “I don’t know how to do an airplane.”
Mohamad: “Majd, I do you an airplane? Baa’melak airplane?”

Majd: “Yes, and I will do an Octopus.”

Mohamad: “I cannot put this one.”

Majd: “Try to erson an airplane instead. I finished my Octopus, khalasset. Now I will do a circle. How will do it? Keef?”

Mohamad: “I made it! Look!”

Majd: “Can you se3edne Mohamad do mine?”

Mohamad: “Yes. You do it like this and like this again.” (Showing him how to fold the paper)

Get the paper out. Look at me I will do it like this, do metle.

Majd: “Hiek? Mohamad keef?”

Mohamad:”Yes like this, and then finish. I made it!”

(Mohamad helps Majd with his airplane)

Mohamad: “I forgot how I did it. I cannot do it.”

Majd: “Keef 3emelta inta? Do it plz!”

Majd: “Miss Amal, please help me make an airplane.”

Mohamad: “Majd rooh kebba and jeeb another paper white and I will help you. The other one m shtaghalet.”

(Majd gets a new paper and tries again)

Majd: “Tfaddal jebet blue.”

Mohamad: “Ya allah khalas do the blue.”

Mohamad: “Ok finished! Hiek mneeh?”

Majd: “Thank you! Let’s go barra and play with it.”
Throughout this paper different reasons of why children code-switch in a bilingual school in Lebanon were presented. Following the researchers’ observation, four questions were attempted to be answered about students’ code-switching in the Early Years classrooms. These questions were the following:

1. Who do the students code-switch with?

2. In which context do these students code-switch (in the classroom, in the playground, during Arabic/English class etc.)?

3. Why do these students code-switch with these particular people?

4. Why do students code-switch?

The different kinds of code-switching that were most common in the children’s conversations were recognized through analysis of their dialogues, comments and statements then compared with the code-switching typologies used in previous frameworks by McClure (1981). The study used 11 categories in the analysis for conversational code-switching. These categories were used to show the conversational purpose of the code-switch and were always decided in relation to the contextual information at a specific point of the ongoing conversation.

1. Representation of speech: code-switching employed to represent talk.

   “You made a mess badhe illa la mama.”

2. Imitation quotation: code-switching involving imitation and change in tone of voice to play a particular character.

   Student A: “Baddak milk mummy?”
   Student B: “Waa waa, I want milk.”
   Student A: “Here shrab milk.”
3. Turn accommodation: code-switching occurring between speakers’ turns.

   Student D: “Sit down here.”

   Student E: “Heide doctor.”

   Student F: “Ya rab.”

   Student E: “Yalla ana rayeh.”

   Student D: “Can you get me a plate? I’m getting a plate.”

   Student F: “Heide hot oil.”

   Student G: “You want corn?”

   Student E: “Where’s baba?”

   Student F: “Hue barra, outside.”

   Student D: “Yi it fell. Ghaslili yeha.”

   Student F: “I like to eat pretend food.”

   Student D: “Yalla give me my carrot.”

   Student E: “Ana rayeh a siyara dawira.”

   Student G: “Badna rouh al AUH njib dawa.”


   **Student X:** “Hey la ilak? Not mine.”

   **Student Y:** “Heide pink?”

   **Student Z:** “My mama is gonna be angry laino there’s play dough on my nails.”

5. Insistence (non-command): code-switching indicating a child’s persistence in a specific idea. The child usually repeated the same utterance in both languages.

   “Yalla, let’s go.”
6. Emphasis (command): code-switching used to put emphasis on a specific command.

   “Let’s go outside, *yalla* come on.”

7. Clarification or persuasion: code-switching giving more information to clarify an idea or message.

   “*Heida la ana*, No, this is for me *wallah*.”

8. Person specification: code-switching occurring when children referred to another person during their conversation.

   **Student X**: “Look there’s *ajine* on the table. You want to play with the *ajine*?”
   **Student Y**: “*Ajine*?”
   **Student X**: “Yeah.”
   **Student Y**: “Look what we have on the table. Student X tell her.”
   **Student X**: “It’s *ajine*, we’re playing with it.”


   **Student X**: “*Baddeh rouh aal beit*. What happened?”

   **Student Y**: “*Badek trouhi aal beit*? I’ll tell my mum *ino baddik trouhi aal beit*.”

10. Discourse marker: Discourse markers are linguistic elements that do not necessarily add to the content of the utterance but act as markers of the context in which the utterance is taking place.

    “*wahad la ana, wahad la ilek o.k.?*”

11. Other: This last category was used to code instances in which a word was unknown to the child in a specific language either L1 or L2 and where words or sentences were non-existent in L2.
Example 1

“No, no don’t put too much juice. Haram heida.”

Example 2

“Bismillah rahman rahim, my mum say we have to pray before I eat.”

The students in the Early Years mainly used four functions out of the ten named above. These functions included: Representation of speech, imitation quotation, turn accommodation, and code-switching was used to code instances in which a word was unknown to the child in a specific language either L1 or L2 and where words or sentences were non-existent in L2. The results show two different aspects of why children code-switch, first, code-switching by children who are learning two languages is due to some lack of ability to use one language at a time, second, it also shows that the children used code-switching as an approach to expand their communicative competence through peer interaction.

During my close examination of the children’s language, it seemed that the distinguishing language and code-switching used by children usually reflected on the ways in which language is used in their community. During play children’s use of language was imitated by the way their parents and other adults spoke to each other and around them. It was clear that the older the children got the less frequent and less likely they code-switched with each other, their teachers and other members of their community. An extreme common word that many children seemed to use was ‘yalla’ (let’s go). It is believed that this is an obtained behaviour which the children have learnt from their parents, members of their family and friends. Another reason being is that the word ‘yalla’ seems to be part of the Lebanese people and their culture. During my examination in one of the classroom, observation of a few families and their children were made.
As I listened and noted the interaction between them and their parents it was revealed that many parents spoke to their children in a language other than English and Arabic. Parents’ code-switching with their children was very frequent. It was observed that if they were carrying a conversation with their child the language being spoken was steady and no code-switching occurred, on the other hand, when parents were giving instructions to their children in order for them to put the back packs away for example, they code-switched from either Spanish, French or Arabic to English. The researcher informally asked some parents of the reasons they are speaking a second or third language to their child. Some of the reasons parents code-switch are:

1. Parents wanting to go back to the country they were previously living with and therefore wanted to keep the language alive in order for their child not to forget and have to go back to learning the language all over again.

2. Some parents want their child to learn English, French and Arabic since Lebanon is a multilingual society.

3. Other parents want their children to learn more languages for business reasons in the future.

4. Parents believed that globalization and communications are bringing the world closer together and therefore believe that their children should be competent in other languages.

Depending on the situation it seemed at times that children, who have developed bilingual competence were aware of their listeners’ linguistic abilities and accommodated to their peers’ skills. The children during peer interaction used the language with which they felt most comfortable and had greater competence with their friends and teachers. One incident happened at the drama centre where three children were role playing and talking with each other in Arabic and then at time code-switching to English. When a boy who did not speak Arabic approached
the group, the group immediately and unconsciously started to speak in English with the boy. The example is shown below:

**Student X**: “Ana al mama, and you the baba.”

**Student Y**: “La ana badi koun el baba.”

**Student Z**: “O.K. ana the baby.”

**Student X**: “Eh ana al mama, inta al baba w inta el baby.”

*Student A joins the group*

**Student Y**: “Do you want to play with us Student A?”

**Student A**: “Yes.”

**Student X**: “You can be the uncle.”

**Student A**: “I want to be the big brother.”

**Student Z**: “You’re the big brother and I’m the baby O.K.?”

**Student A**: “O.K.”

Children controlled their language in order to make sure the other children understood what they were trying to communicate. The findings from this study confirmed McClure’s (1981) previous finding that using code-switching to clarify meaning through translation seems to be learned at quite a young age and shifting from one topic to another appears to be a kind of code-switch that is learned at an earlier age than other, more sophisticated types of code switches.

The results of this study also reveal that those speakers with the maximum amount of bilingual communicative capability are the ones who most often use code-switching as a strategy to meet their conversational aims and to interact with their peers. As in Ruiz’s (1984) study the findings propose that a positive association is present between bilingual code-switching and language proficiency, and that code-switching can be interpreted to reflect the child’s developing
communicative competence. As shown in the results above children through peer interaction use the language with which they feel more comfortable and have greater capability. The results also indicate that those speakers with the maximum degree of bilingual communicative competence are the ones who most frequently use code-switching as an approach to meet their conversational goals and to communicate with their peers. The findings showed that the children were aware of their listeners’ linguistic abilities and accommodated to their peers’ skills as in the interaction revealed above. It was found in this study that the children spent a great amount of time during free-play engaged in authentically social interaction including talk.

The results from this study also confirms the results in Eldrige’s (1996, p.305) study where students 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.

In another observation during conversation in the second language (English) between the students it was observed that sometimes it was difficult for some students to retrieve certain words in English, the students therefore instead of stopping the sentence ended up using their native language in order to be able to communicate with their peers. It might be proposed that this is a method used by the students in order to avoid pause in communication, this may perhaps be because of lack of fluency in the second language. The learners when code-switching may not be able to recall the appropriate structure in the second language.

Example 1

“X, heida for X.”

Example 2
“Heida is yours.”

Example 3

“Leiki I found yours.”

Many times when students found it difficult to use certain words in English, it was observed that they related to the vocabulary and words in Arabic. As in Edgrige’s (1996, p. 305) study this process is called equivalence. The students made use of the native equivalent of a certain lexical item in English and therefore code-switch to Arabic. This method may be associated with the lack in linguistic competence of the English language, which makes the student use Arabic lexical item when they do not have the capability for using the English language explanation for a certain lexical item. Therefore, using the equivalent word in Arabic functions as a defensive instrument for students as it gives them the chance to continue communication by linking the gaps resulting from foreign language incompetence. Below is an example of a two children talking to each other about the Lebanese Independence Day:

**Student A:** “We gonna celebrate kuluna lil watan. It’s for Lebanon.”

**Student B:** “Yeah, it’s Lebanon’s birthday today.”

**Student A:** “We going to see the jeish.”

Students used more English than Arabic while interacting with one another. When the students played in the drama centre during free-play frequently used a lot of Arabic words or sentences, this is due to the fact that they were mainly imitating their relatives’ speech. They tended to make conversations in Arabic and when it was difficult for them to retrieve certain words in Arabic they would find the equivalence in English and use it. This is shown in the examples below:
Example 1

**Student X:** “Labsiya tannoura the laabe is really cold.”

**Student Y:** “No, she’s going to have a bath.”

**Student X:** “Taamiya, she’s hungry.”

Example 2

**Student X:** “Mama what we’re gonna do now?”

**Student Y:** “We’re going to eat.”

**Student X:** “O.K. yalla lets go.”

**Student Y:** “Wait, wait, first badna to wash our hands.”

The students also tended to code-switch while eating during snack time. The reason mainly being that when asking each other about the different kinds of food they have, the children did not know the words of food in English and therefore used Arabic instead. Below is an example of children code-switching during snack time:

**Teacher:** “What’s this?”

**Student X:** “Popcorn nuggets.”

**Student Y:** “Me, I want batata.”

**Student Z:** “I like pizza.”

**Student X:** “Me, I like manoushe.”

**Student Z:** “Manoushe?”

**Student X:** “Yeah.”

**Student Z:** “And ana kamen.”

**Student Y:** “I like zaatar manoushe.”

Other than being incompetent in the English language some words in Arabic are non-existent in English, an example of this are names of food such as *manoushe*. The students also tended to
use words such as *yalla* which is believed to be a word many people in the Lebanese society use and therefore it is known to be part of the Lebanese culture. Another commonly used word by many people is *zaatar*, it is mainly used since people are used to saying it in Arabic and therefore it has become a word that they use in English sentences even though there is a replacement word for it in English (thyme).

Different perspectives on code-switching occurred between teachers who taught in the school. I interviewed five teachers in the Early Years department. The teachers taught different leveled classes, three of the teachers taught KG2, one teacher taught KG1, and two teachers taught nursery. It was evident from the interview that four of the teachers code-switched with students when they thought they needed to. The five teachers had different views of whether they should code-switch with the students or not, but some felt it was necessary in order to make sure some of the children who had a limited understanding of English would comprehend what was being said or asked of them. One of the teachers who was interviewed felt that if she code-switched during instruction that it would confuse the students. One of the teachers who was interviewed is American and has been in Lebanon for three years, therefore her Arabic is very limited, only knowing a few words and unable to code-switch as much with her students who sometimes had difficulty in understand what was being said in the classroom. But as she interacted with the children she sometimes felt she needed to translate some words to the children in Arabic to explain to them what was expected of them and therefore resorted to the limited Arabic she knows. One of the teachers felt it was necessary to code-switch since she taught a nursery class and one of the students had entered the nursery class having limited knowledge of English. Therefore, the teacher would instruct the student in English and then translate the words or sentences in Arabic to make sure the child understood. The teacher also
asked the student to repeat simple words in English and Arabic to make sure he understood what was happening. It was noted by the researcher that most of the time code-switching in KG1 and KG2 occurred during snack or recess time. But in the nursery class it was mainly during centres, recess, and often during snack time. Therefore code-switching in all three levels occurred while students interacted with each other, whether during centres, snack or recess. Some of the teachers believed that the reason the students code-switch is because it is modeled by their parents and that this was evident during peer interaction mostly in the drama centre, since student imitated their parents’ speech. Two of the teachers believe that the reason some of the students code-switch is mainly with children who are weak in the target language and it is intended to transfer the intended meaning and make sure the content is clearly understood by their friends. Some of the teachers believe that code-switching in their classroom between teacher and student occurs intentionally in order to transfer the necessary knowledge for the students for clarity. Following the instruction in the target language the teachers code-switch to the native language in order to clarify meaning, and this way stresses importance in the foreign language content for efficient comprehension. Some teachers believe that the students code-switch as a defense mechanism, as it gives the students the opportunity to continue communication by bridging the gaps resulting from foreign language incompetence. They also repeat their message in the native tongue in order to make sure their friends understand the content of what they want to say. Other teachers believe that some of the children code-switch unintentionally because of language incompetence and because some words are non-existent in English. Even thought the school is an international school and instruction should be given in English, it is sometimes difficult for teachers not to code-switch because of certain situations such as having a child who is incompetent in the target language.
This chapter reported the results of the study. Conclusion, implications, and limitations will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

Questions on code-switching in the context of English language classes in one of the Lebanese schools were attempted to be answered in this project. This study analyzed code-switching in a total of twenty preschool students whose age varied between 3-6 years and five teachers who taught different leveled classes. A variety of children of different language ability were selected and included in the observation process for the research project. The analysis mainly focused on the reasons the students in preschool in one of the Lebanese schools code-switch. The analysis of the data mainly exposed why the students and teachers code-switch and in which setting. It was revealed that some students code-switched because of language incompetence and others code-switched with other students who are weak in the target language.

This study proved that the children use code-switching to negotiate the language for interaction and to adapt to other students’ favoured language and their capability in addition to manage conversational talk. Opposing to the notion that code-switching is a proof of shortage in linguistic capability in bilingual speakers, the study proposes that code-switching is employed as a supplementary resource to attain certain conversational objectives in interactions with other bilingual speakers. Language accessibility might be the main reason of why children code-switch with each other. The students who participated in this study seemed to switch languages whenever a word in the target language was not available.

However, this study presented some interaction among school children in multilingual settings. The study also revealed that young children in the school setting used code-switching for several reasons; for play, for pretend play, during interaction while in recess, while doing
different activities in class, and during snack time. It was evident that the children while in different setting code-switched in order to clarify language with other students, for translation, for emphasis, and when a word in the target language was not accessible at the time.

The study presented two different features of why children code-switch. First, code-switching by children who are learning two languages is due to some lack of ability to use one language at a time, second, it also showed that the children used code-switching as an approach to expand their communicative competence through peer interaction. During the researcher’s close examination of children’s language, it was evident that the distinguishing language and code-switching used by children usually reflected on the ways in which language is used in their community. During play children’s use of language was imitated by the way their parents and other adults spoke to each other and around them. It was clear that the older the children got the less frequent and less likely they code-switched with each other, their teachers and other members of their community.

As some teachers believe that it was inappropriate to code-switch with students, others believe it was necessary for translation since a very limited number of students were weak in English and some entered the school not knowing English at all. Some teachers believed it was necessary for clarification and that code-switching was intended to transfer the meaning correctly and to make sure that the content was clearly understood. As opposed to the students teachers never code-switched unintentionally, code-switching occurred between them and the students for specific reasons.
**Implications**

Most of the research on code-switching has mainly been conducted on older children and little research on code-switching has been done on young preschool children. Therefore, more research on young children and the reasons they code-switch should be conducted in the schools of Lebanon. The results of this study provided support of the reasons different children code-switch in the early years classes. The results showed that most of the children who participated in this project tended to code-switch since they had limited knowledge of the second language, the results also showed that the students used words that were not available in English and therefore had to resort to Arabic instead, and other students code-switched because they felt they needed to in order to clarify meaning to peers who had a limited understanding of English.

Is code-switching time consuming? Although some evidence suggests that language switching is strategic and occurs only when bilinguals have enough time to select the appropriate lexicon, empirical research is needed to clarify the linguistic as well as the psycholinguistic factors influencing this language switch (Heredia & Altarriba, 2001). More research should be done on young children and whether code-switching is time consuming. Research should also be conducted on young children and effects it has on the thinking process of the child.

There are some concerns that young children do not understand that they are learning two languages. This is especially true when they code-switch or mix two languages. As children are learning two languages, there may be words they know in one language but not the other. It is natural for them to use words they know from both languages. However, their switches are grammatically correct. They use a word they know in one language to substitute for a word they don’t know in the other. As their vocabulary grows this becomes less frequent (Deiner, 2010).
Therefore, parents and teachers should include a language-rich environment in whatever language they are trying to teach their child. Some aspects of second language acquisition are the same as first-language learning, others differ. Teachers should provide a language rich environment for their students in schools. It is important for teachers to use one language in the class for instruction and not switch from one language to another in order for the students to be fluent in one language in order to communicate with others in school. Parents at home should also use one language as children will get used to speaking in that specific language to their parents. Therefore, in school children will use one language and at home they will speak another. Children will then be in two different situations where they will learn two languages fluently. At school teachers should provide a language rich environment in the classroom. Teachers should also use different strategies in order to facilitate learning for the children. Teachers could place the child with children who are fluent in a second language in order for the children to learn from each other and play songs for children to sing.

**Limitations of the study**

This study was conducted in the Early Years department in one school in Beirut, Lebanon. The study was conducted on a group of twenty early years students and the participants were of different ages varying between three and six years over a period of ten weeks. Therefore, I cannot generalize the findings since the research was conducted in a small period of time with little resources, time and a minimal number of students; thus my results are neither valid nor reliable, yet such paper is a start that sheds light on an important language aspect of the children in the Lebanese schools. This study does not apply to all students studying in the schools of Lebanon.
Suggestions for further research

Since most of the research on code-switching has been conducted on adults more research on the reasons very young bilingual children code-switch should be made. Other research should be done on the presentation of the literature on mixing in bilingual children during the earliest of language acquisition. Researches should also look at what does the phenomenon of mixing look like in bilingual children since most of the studies on bilingual language acquisition state that there is a stage in which children tend to mix to a great extent. More research should be done on the different reasons bilingual children mix, and on whether language mixing depends on the development of the two lexicons. This presupposes that the mixed word is only available in one language, that is, that the equivalent word has not been acquired yet. Other research should be done on whether mixing is due to different developments of the two grammars, in the sense that children tend to mix words from the more developed language into the slower one. Further research should also be conducted on the different kinds of elements children mix, in order to reveal whether children mix different elements than adults.
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Appendix A

Student X: “Tomorrow ma fi school, it’s Friday.”

Teacher: “Right, there’s no school tomorrow because it’s the weekend.”

“Wallah it’s raining.”

“Yala lets go to the playground.”

“My mum wears like this, like hajjeh.”

“Heida la ana, No, this is for me wallah.”

“Where’s X, ma fi X bas ana and Y.”

“X, heida for X.”

“Heida is yours.”

“Leiki I found yours.”

“My mum said that when I am done with the labneh I have to close it. I can’t ma fi.”

“Hala bado ijib cake baba.”

“Yala go faster.”

“Ya allah I fell.”

“Oh oh, Kahraba rahet. After it will come. Yeah it has come.”

Student: “This is two beitingen.”

Teacher: “Are these two eggplants?”
“I want to bring the table over here.”

**Student X:** “Look there’s *ajine* on the table. You want to play with the *ajine*?”

**Student Y:** “*Ajine*?”

**Student X:** “Yeah.”

**Student Y:** “Look what we have on the table. X tell her.”

**Student X:** “It’s *ajine*, we’re playing with it.”

“We have lots of *sammak* here.”

**Teacher:** “Finish your sandwich so you can go to the playground.”

**Student:** “*Ana khalaset, ma badi* my sandwich anymore.”

**Teacher:** “Are you going to play with the puzzles?”

**Student:** “*Ana ma bade* to play *hon*. I want to play with the fish.”

“I want to make like this hair, I want to put my *bookel*.”

“X went asleep *kamen*.”

**Student X:** “The *kahraba* go.”

**Student Y:** “There’s no *kahraba*.”

**Student Z:** “Aahh the *kahraba* has come.”

**Teacher:** “Come on X finish washing your hands so you can have your snack.”

**Student X:** “But I haven’t finished I want to put *saboun*, my mama say I have to put *saboun* when I wash my hands.”

**Student X:** “I want to wash my hands.”

**Student Y:** “My hand is all *saboun*.”

“I’ll put these in my backpack, *bas heide mush la ili*.”
“No, no don’t put too much juice. *Haram heida.*”

“*Bismillah rahman rahim,* my mum say we have to pray before I eat.”

“You have to eat with a spoon not with your hand. This is *baida labneh.*”

“Where’s *kahraba?* Why there’s no light?”

**Student X:** “*Baddeh rouh aal beit.* What happened?”

**Student Y:** “*Badek trouhi aal beit?* I’ll tell my mum *ino baddik trouhi aal beit.*”

“Shoufu the window.”

**Student X:** “*Labsiya tannoura* the laabe is really cold.”

**Student Y:** “No, she’s going to have a bath.”

**Student X:** “*Taamiya,* she’s hungry.”

“I have a *wawa houn.*”

“This has *hamoud.*”

“*Ana taabeneh,* I don’t want to do this, my *batoun* is hurt.”

“X spit on me *kamen.*”

“I’m not a boy, he’s pushing me *shou heida.*”

“My daddy went on the *tayara.*”

**Student X:** “Look at my *wawa.* Look *shoufi heida* my *wawa.*”

**Student Y:** “Miss look she has a *wawa.*”

“I have inside *labneh.*”
Teacher: “What do you have there?”

Student: I have labban sweet.”

Teacher: “That natural yogurt must taste really nice.”

Student: “Yeah.”

“I’m not going to swim today laino I have a runny nose.”

“Hala it’s my turn.”

Teacher: “Would you like to help me water the plants?”

Student: “I want to laino those people are playing lemonade.”

“You made a mess  baddeh illa la mam.”

Student: “Do you know what this is called?”

Teacher: “A fish.”

Student: “No, it’s umm a samaka. It’s a sammaka dahabiya”

Teacher: “Yes, a gold fish.”

Student X: “Let’s put water on the plants.”

Student Y: “Ouf ouf, you put too much water.”

Student: “Do you know what this is called?”

Teacher: “Why don’t you tell me?”

Student: “It’s a samaka.”

Teacher: “You mean a fish?”

Student: “Yes, but Ms. X and Ms. Y call it a sammaka.”

Teacher: “That’s because they are your Arabic teachers.”

Student:”Yes.”
Student X: “Do you know what this is called?”
Student Y: “Yeah.”
Student X: “It’s labban.”

Student: “Ms. X, Karma is not coming today.”
Teacher: “Oh really, Why isn’t she coming.”
Student: “Karma is marida, she hurt her batn.”
Teacher: “X and Y, please walk in class.”
Student: “But he wants to take my dabdoub.”

Student: “Look Ms. X! Look!”
Teacher: “What is it?”
Student: “It’s a akhtabout. Look the akhtabout has a mouth.”

Teacher: “What did you have for lunch yesterday?”
Student: “Yesterday I ate kibbeh.”

Student: “Ms. X look what I made.”
Teacher: “Look at all the colours you used.”
Student: “It’s a samaka dahabiyah.”

Student X: “Look Ms. X, she has a chocolate croissant.”
Student Y: “No, mush chocolate, it’s zaatar.”

“Me, I like batata, nuggets, and ketchup.”

Student: “You know I’m going to teta’s house.”
Teacher: “Wow, that must be exciting.”
**Student**: “You know *teta X* is auntie ‘s mum.”

**Student**: “Do you know who her dad is?”

**Teacher**: “No, I don’t, who is he?”

**Student**: “He is *giddo.*”

**Teacher**: “What’s this?”

**Student X**: “Popcorn nuggets.”

**Student Y**: “Me, I want *batata.*”

**Student Z**: “I like pizza.”

**Student X**: “Me, I like *manoushe.*”

**Student Z**: “*Manoushe?*”

**Student X**: “Yeah.”

**Student Z**: “And *ana kamen.*”

“*Masha2 Allah* what a nice story.”

“*X badak* plasticine?”

**Student X**: “Mama what we’re gonna do now?”

**Student Y**: “We’re going to eat.”

**Student X**: “O.K. *yalla* lets go.”

**Student Y**: “Wait, wait, first *badna* to wash our hands.”

**Student X**: “*X shoufi heida la ana.*”

**Student Y**: “*La2 bas inti shoufi.*”

**Student X**: “I wanna go to my mummy.”

**Student Z**: “*Heide la ilak laino ana aindi hounike.*”

**Student X**: “*Heide ktir helou.*”
Student Z: “It’s mine.”

Student X: “I’m dizzy.”

Student Y: “I’m dizzy too.”

Student Z: “I’m not dizzy hamdillah.”

“Are you wearing a shirwel? Everyone is wearing a shirwel.”

“My mum said she’s going to pick me up inshallah.”

“I went to teta’s house yesterday and ate a lot mashallah.”

“I went to the dentist and the doctor fi glasses.”

“X hone, you have to put this next to me.”

“I put this here on my batouna. I have a wawa. He wants to see my wawa.”

“wahad la ana, wahad la ilek o.k..”

“Shoufi my baba went to Spain.”

“Ana andi pumpkin big.”

“I have an allergy in my belly, walla tomorrow I’m going to the doctor.”

Student X: “You don’t like heida?”

Student Y: “I like olives, w inti?”

Student X: “I like it.”

“This is teta Salma.”

“This is teta’s hair.”
“I’m gonna make my teta later.”

“Heida sticks?”

“Dalik houn? You stay here?”

“Ouf shaub it’s hot.”

“Yalla, let’s go outside to play.”

“Ouch, sikhneh, be careful the playdough is hot.”

“This one is hard kame.”

“Hey la ilak? Not mine.”

“Heide pink?”

“My mama is gonna be angry laino there’s play dough on my nails.”

“Wo was sitting here? Ana kamen I don’t know.”

Student: “You have Hello Kitty earings?”
Teacher: “No, I don’t.”
Student: “Mbala I saw them.”

“My mama said to stay in the shade laino there’s no sun.”

“This is the plaster laino he have waw.”

“Hon you put the leg.”

“My mummy said ma fi school.”
“I have sandwich *kamen.*”

“I have *zaatar.*”

**Student X:** “My nose and my mouth.”

**Student Y:** “Now I’m gonna draw my nose, ba3den my hair.”

**Student Z:** “A happy face for me.”

“My mum said that when I eat I have to say *Bismillah al rahman al rahim.*”

“*Ya Allah* why did the computer stop.”

**Teacher:** “We are going to send a bag home for you to collect items you don’t need, you can put things such as ribbons, corks, old pencils. What other things do you think you could put in this bag?”

**Student A:** “Buttons.”

**Student B:** “*Bijoux.*”

**Student X:** “*Como ca va, bien? Oui. Tell me oui.*”

**Student Y:** “What it means?”

**Student X:** “It means how are you? Repeat say *como ca va?*”

“I have *scarbina,* you have shoes?”

**Student D:** “*Badak sakkira?*”

**Student E:** “*Eh.*”

**Student D:** “Ms. X, can you help student E tie his laces?”
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Children in the Early Years Classrooms Code-switching

Teacher Interview Questions
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In foreign language classes, sometimes teachers and students may shift from one language to another (e.g. from English to Arabic) in their teaching and learning. This phenomenon is called code-switching which refers to the alternate use of the first language and the target language.

1. Does the switching from English to Arabic occur in your class? If so, do you use the same amount of Arabic as English? Explain.
   -Yes, it does.

2. Does code-switching occur between you a certain students? If so why do you code-switch with these particular students? (e.g. do they not know the word in the target language?)
   -No, it doesn’t.

3. Why do you think certain children code-switch?
   -It is modeled by their parents and other people around them.
   -They do that when learning a new language.

4. Is there a certain pattern that students follow when code-switching? If so explain.
   -They usually use endearment phrases and words that are emotionally charged.
5. How does your language affect your students’ language behavior in class? (e.g. does the students’ decisions on what language to use often depend on the level of language difficulty, question complexity and/or comments you make?)
   - When they struggle to find the right English word, they substitute it with an Arabic one.

6. Do students code-switch with particular people? (e.g. friends) If so with whom and why do these students code-switch with these particular people?
   - They switch with friends who do that.

7. In which context do these students code-switch? (in the classroom, in the playground, during Arabic/English class).
   - In the classroom, mostly at free choice time and on the playground.

8. If you code-switch in your classroom is it:
   - For translation

Please elaborate

9. How do children use Code-Switching during peer interactions?
   - They code-switch (speak in Arabic) with students whose first language is Arabic and who express themselves mostly in Arabic. They avoid that with English native speakers.

10. Is there an effect of context on the type of Code-Switching and language used by school children (e.g., social setting vs. school-related setting)?
We expect code-switching to be more frequent in social settings as students are always reminded and encouraged to speak in English in school-related settings.
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1. Does the switching from English to Arabic occur in your class? If so, do you use the same amount of Arabic as English? Explain.

The use of both English and Arabic simultaneously or interchangeably occurs regularly in my class (KG2). Students often move back and forth between the two languages mainly during centers, free play, snack time or recess.

2. Does code-switching occur between you a certain students? If so why do you code-switch with these particular students? (e.g. do they not know the word in the target language?)

Code switching seldom occurs between me and students because I believe that using two languages to teach a lesson might lead to some undesired student behaviors. A student who is sure that the instruction in foreign language will be followed by a native language translation may loose interest in listening to the former instruction which will have negative academic consequences; as the student is exposed to foreign language discourse limitedly.
3. Why do you think certain children code-switch? I think certain children resort to code-switching in order to hide fluency or memory or to mark switching from informal situations to formal situations.

4. Is there a certain pattern that students follow when code-switching? If so explain. There is no specific pattern that the students follow when they code-switch from English to Arabic.

5. How does your language affect your students’ language behavior in class? (e.g. does the students' decisions on what language to use often depend on the level of language difficulty, question complexity and/or comments you make?) Some students tend to think that it is more appropriate to code switch in order to indicate to the teacher that the content is clearly understood by him/her. Also, they might resort to code-switching to fill the stopgap during a dialogue between him/her and the teacher.

6. Do students code-switch with particular people? (e.g. friends) If so with whom and why do these students code-switch with these particular people? Students tend to code-switch mainly with friends who are weak in the target language (English) to transfer the intended meaning and make sure the content is clearly understood by their friends.

7. In which context do these students code-switch? (in the classroom, in the playground, during Arabic/English class). Usually, the students code-switch during free-play, centers and during recess time.

8. If you code-switch in your classroom is it:
   a. Intentional
b. Unintentional

c. Spontaneous

d. For translation

Please elaborate

If I code switch in my classroom it is intentional, mainly for translation, and serves as a repetitive function. In this case, I use code switching in order to transfer the necessary knowledge for the students for clarity. Following the instruction in target language, I code switch to the native language in order to clarify meaning, and in this way stresses importance on the foreign language content for efficient comprehension.

9. How do children use Code-Switching during peer interactions?

Children resort to code-switching during peer interactions as a defensive mechanism as it gives the student the opportunity to continue communication by bridging the gaps resulting from foreign language incompetence. They also repeat the message in their native tongue in order to make sure their friends understood the content of what they want to say.

10. Is there an effect of context on the type of Code-Switching and language used by schoolchildren (e.g., social setting vs. school-related setting)? Code switching will be used more often between students in interactive social situations such as snack time or recess as opposed to academic settings. Since social settings are more informal than school related settings students preferred to code switch in order to keep conversations private, to explain or clarify directions, to translate, and mainly to make decisions or discuss in small groups.
In foreign language classes, sometimes teachers and students may shift from one language to another (e.g. from English to Arabic) in their teaching and learning. This phenomenon is called code-switching which refers to the alternate use of the first language and the target language.

1. Does the switching from English to Arabic occur in your class? If so, do you use the same amount of Arabic as English? Explain. No I do not use Arabic in class with my students.

2. Does code-switching occur between you and certain students? If so why do you code-switch with these particular students? (e.g. do they not know the word in the target language?) I do not use Arabic with any student in class.

3. Why do you think certain children code-switch? I think such children do not have enough English words in their ‘word bank’ to express themselves.

4. Is there a certain pattern that students follow when code-switching? If so explain. I notice that when children are either very angry or happy, they tend to code switch. This might be a result of the rush of emotions, which might interfere with their thinking process.
5. How does your language affect your students’ language behavior in class? (e.g. does the students’ decisions on what language to use often depend on the level of language difficulty, question complexity and/or comments you make?) Students tend to speak English with me at all times because I choose to speak in English with them.

6. Do students code-switch with particular people? (e.g. friends) If so with whom and why do these students code-switch with these particular people? I noticed that the students whose English is weaker than others tend to code switch with each other.

7. In which context do these students code-switch? (in the classroom, in the playground, during Arabic/English class). Classroom and playground.

8. If you code-switch in your classroom is it:
   a. Intentional
   b. Unintentional
   c. Spontaneous
   d. For translation

Please elaborate

9. How do children use Code-Switching during peer interactions? If a student is angry or too excited, he/she throws in a few Arabic words in his/her sentences.
10. Is there an effect of context on the type of Code-Switching and language used by School children (e.g., social setting vs. school-related setting)? I am not sure. I think the context which effects the code switching depends on who the student is with and what the student is trying to express.
In foreign language classes, sometimes teachers and students may shift from one language to another (e.g. from English to Arabic) in their teaching and learning. This phenomenon is called code-switching which refers to the alternate use of the first language and the target language.

1. Does the switching from English to Arabic occur in your class? If so, do you use the same amount of Arabic as English? Explain.
   a. My Arabic knowledge is limited. I occasionally use a word to get students attention or to relate in a culturally appropriate way, but it is not used to help students understand what I’m trying to communicate. I will occasionally translate a word if I know it and some students don’t know the word in English.

2. Does code-switching occur between you a certain students? If so why do you code-switch with these particular students? (e.g. do they not know the word in the target language?)
   No
3. Why do you think certain children code-switch? I notice code-switching in some student-to-student interactions. This primarily happens among students who speak Arabic at home with siblings.

4. Is there a certain pattern that students follow when code-switching? If so explain.

   They start in English, but when they cannot communicate fast enough for the conversation, they switch to Arabic.

5. How does your language affect your students’ language behavior in class? (e.g. does the students' decisions on what language to use often depend on the level of language difficulty, question complexity and/or comments you make?) I have been with my students for a year and a half now, and noticed after about 8 months that they were restructuring sentences the way that I speak, and also using phrases and comments that I use. I overhear student comments like “stop it!” when most Lebanese English-speakers would use the Arabic word “khalas.”

6. Do students code-switch with particular people? (e.g. friends) If so with whom and why do these students code-switch with these particular people? See #3

7. In which context do these students code-switch? (in the classroom, in the playground, during Arabic/English class). I notice this in all situations, but particularly in groups of two (only one partner).

8. If you code-switch in your classroom is it:
   a. Intentional
b. Unintentional

c. Spontaneous

d. For translation

Please elaborate

9. How do children use Code-Switching during peer interactions?

10. Is there an effect of context on the type of Code-Switching and language used by schoolchildren (e.g., social setting vs. school-related setting)?