



MA Thesis Submitted to the English Language Department in
Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Teaching
English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)

By:

Hakimeh Ayoobiyan

Supervised by:

Dr. Reza Ghafar Samar

Advisor:

Dr. Ramin Akbari






January – 2011

In the Name of God
the Compassionate, the
Merciful

Approval of Thesis

This thesis "**Functions of Teacher and Student Code Switching in ELT Classroom**" has been approved by the committee on final examination in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL).

Committee on final examination

1. Supervisor: Dr. R. G. Samar 
2. Advisor: Dr. Ramin Akbari 
3. Internal Reader: Dr. G. R. Kiany 
4. External Reader: Dr. Abdollahzadeh 
5. Head of English Department 

آیین‌نامه حق مالکیت مادی و معنوی در مورد نتایج پژوهش‌های علمی دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

مقدمه: با عنایت به سیاست‌های پژوهشی و فناوری دانشگاه در راستای تحقق عدالت و کرامت انسانها که لازمه شکوفایی علمی و فنی است و رعایت حقوق مادی و معنوی دانشگاه و پژوهشگران، لازم است اعضای هیأت علمی، دانشجویان، دانش‌آموختگان و دیگر همکاران طرح، در مورد نتایج پژوهش‌های علمی که تحت عناوین پایان‌نامه، رساله و طرح‌های تحقیقاتی یا هماهنگی دانشگاه انجام شده است، موارد زیر را رعایت نمایند:

ماده ۱- حق نشر و تکثیر پایان‌نامه/ رساله و درآمدهای حاصل از آنها متعلق به دانشگاه می‌باشد ولی حقوق معنوی پدید آورندگان محفوظ خواهد بود.

ماده ۲- انتشار مقاله یا مقالات مستخرج از پایان‌نامه/ رساله به صورت چاپ در نشریات علمی و یا ارائه در مجامع علمی باید به نام دانشگاه بوده و با تایید استاد راهنمای اصلی، یکی از اساتید راهنما، مشاور و یا دانشجو مسئول مکاتبات مقاله باشد. ولی مسئولیت علمی مقاله مستخرج از پایان‌نامه و رساله به عهده اساتید راهنما و دانشجو می‌باشد.

تبصره: در مقالاتی که پس از دانش‌آموختگی بصورت ترکیبی از اطلاعات جدید و نتایج حاصل از پایان‌نامه/ رساله نیز منتشر می‌شود نیز باید نام دانشگاه درج شود.

ماده ۳- انتشار کتاب، نرم افزار و یا آثار ویژه (اثری هنری مانند فیلم، عکس، نقاشی و نمایشنامه) حاصل از نتایج پایان‌نامه/ رساله و تمامی طرح‌های تحقیقاتی کلیه واحدهای دانشگاه اعم از دانشکده ها، مراکز تحقیقاتی، پژوهشکده ها، پارک علم و فناوری و دیگر واحدها باید با مجوز کتبی صادره از معاونت پژوهشی دانشگاه و براساس آئین نامه های مصوب انجام شود.

ماده ۴- ثبت اختراع و تدوین دانش فنی و یا ارائه یافته ها در جشنواره‌های ملی، منطقه‌ای و بین‌المللی که حاصل نتایج مستخرج از پایان‌نامه/ رساله و تمامی طرح‌های تحقیقاتی دانشگاه باید با هماهنگی استاد راهنما یا مجری طرح از طریق معاونت پژوهشی دانشگاه انجام گیرد.

ماده ۵- این آیین‌نامه در ۵ ماده و یک تبصره در تاریخ ۸۷/۴/۱ در شورای پژوهشی و در تاریخ ۸۷/۴/۲۲ در هیأت رئیسه دانشگاه به تایید رسید و در جلسه مورخ ۸۷/۷/۱۵ شورای دانشگاه به تصویب رسیده و از تاریخ تصویب در شورای دانشگاه لازم‌الاجرا است.

اینجانب: علیرضا آفرین دانشجوی رشته فلسفه ورودی سال تحصیلی ۸۷-۸۸
مقطع کارشناسی ارشد دانشکده فلسفه متعهد می‌شوم کلیه نکات مندرج در آئین نامه حق مالکیت مادی و معنوی در مورد نتایج پژوهش‌های علمی دانشگاه تربیت مدرس را در انتشار یافته‌های علمی مستخرج از پایان‌نامه / رساله تحصیلی خود رعایت نمایم. در صورت تخلف از مفاد آئین نامه فوق‌الاشعار به دانشگاه وکالت و نمایندگی می‌دهم که از طرف اینجانب نسبت به لغو امتیاز اختراع بنام بنده و یا هر گونه امتیاز دیگر و تغییر آن به نام دانشگاه اقدام نماید. ضمناً نسبت به جبران فوری ضرر و زیان حاصله بر اساس برآورد دانشگاه اقدام خواهم نمود و بدینوسیله حق هر گونه اعتراض را از خود سلب نمودم.

امضاء: علیرضا آفرین
تاریخ: ۸۷/۴/۲۰

آیین نامه چاپ پایان نامه (رساله) های دانشجویان دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

نظر به اینکه چاپ و انتشار پایان نامه (رساله) های تحصیلی دانشجویان دانشگاه تربیت مدرس، مبین بخشی از فعالیتهای علمی - پژوهشی دانشگاه است بنابراین به منظور آگاهی و رعایت حقوق دانشگاه، دانش آموختگان این دانشگاه نسبت به رعایت موارد ذیل متعهد می شوند:

ماده ۱: در صورت اقدام به چاپ پایان نامه (رساله) ی خود، مراتب را قبلاً به طور کتبی به «دفتر نشر آثار علمی» دانشگاه اطلاع دهد.

ماده ۲: در صفحه سوم کتاب (پس از برگ شناسنامه) عبارت ذیل را چاپ کند:

«کتاب حاضر، حاصل پایان نامه کارشناسی ارشد/ رساله دکتری نگارنده در رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی است که در سال ۱۳۹۰ در دانشکده علوم انسانی دانشگاه تربیت مدرس به راهنمایی سرکار خانم/جناب آقای دکتر رضا عطارزاده، مشاوره سرکار خانم/جناب آقای دکتر من ابراهیم و مشاوره سرکار خانم/جناب آقای دکتر از آن دفاع شده است.»

ماده ۳: به منظور جبران بخشی از هزینه های انتشارات دانشگاه، تعداد یک درصد شمارگان کتاب (در هر نوبت چاپ) را به «دفتر نشر آثار علمی» دانشگاه اهدا کند. دانشگاه می تواند مازاد نیاز خود را به نفع مرکز نشر در معرض فروش قرار دهد.

ماده ۴: در صورت عدم رعایت ماده ۳، ۵۰٪ بهای شمارگان چاپ شده را به عنوان خسارت به دانشگاه تربیت مدرس، تأدیه کند.

ماده ۵: دانشجو تعهد و قبول می کند در صورت خودداری از پرداخت بهای خسارت، دانشگاه می تواند خسارت مذکور را از طریق مراجع قضایی مطالبه و وصول کند؛ به علاوه به دانشگاه حق می دهد به منظور استیفای حقوق خود، از طریق دادگاه، معادل وجه مذکور در ماده ۴ را از محل توقیف کتابهای عرضه شده نگارنده برای فروش، تأمین نماید.

ماده ۶: اینجانب به اینجانب اینجانب دانشجوی رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی مقطع کارشناسی ارشد تعهد فوق و ضمانت اجرایی آن را قبول کرده، به آن ملتزم می شوم.

نام و نام خانوادگی: حکیم ابراهیم

تاریخ و امضا: ۱۳۹۰/۰۷/۰۱

This work is dedicated to my dear brother, my first teacher, who taught me how to live, to my parents who have taught me how to stand, to my husband who has taught me how to care for people, to all my teachers and to whom I learned.

Acknowledgements

I want to first acknowledge my mentor, Dr. Ghafarsamar for his support and guidance throughout my thesis. I also want to thank Dr. Akbari and Dr. Kiani for their feedback and helpful suggestions. I also extend my gratitude to Mr. Momeniyan and Mr. Moradkhani who helped me a lot with their invaluable suggestions.

Abstract

This study investigated the functions, types and frequencies of code switching in the teachers and students discourse in ELT classrooms. To this end, the participants of this study including two groups of teachers and students were selected. The first group of participants were two EFL teachers teaching general English courses (at two different levels of proficiency) in an institutional program in Oil Ministry Center of Isfahan. Another group of participants were 20 students in two classes. All sessions of an entire semester was videotaped. A coding scheme was developed for classifying teachers' and students' instances of CS into relevant functions. The current study shows that the majority of CS in the classroom is highly purposeful, and related to pedagogical goals. Also, the research found that pedagogical functions were more frequently fulfilled through CS compared to social functions both for teachers and students. The present study can help teachers to have a better understanding of teacher and student code switching in ELT classrooms and to use CS in the direction of teaching and effective learning.

Keywords: Teacher Code switching, Student Code switching, Functions of Code switching

Table of contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1.	Introduction.....	2
1.2.	Statement of the problem	6
1.3.	Research questions	7
1.4.	Significance of the study	9
1.5.	Limitation of the study.....	10
1.6.	Definition of the key terms	11

Chapter 2: Review of the related literature

2.1.	Overview.....	14
2.2.	Introduction.....	14
2.3.	Code switching: definition	16
2.4.	Types of code switching	17
2.5.	CS and other bilingual phenomena	18
2.6.	The language proficiency level of the students and their use of code switching strategies.....	21
2.7.	Development of classroom code switching research	21

2.8.	Code switching and its status in ELT classrooms: supporting and opposing views.....	22
2.8.1.	Opposing views.....	23
2.8.2.	Supporting view.....	28
2.9.	Teacher's objective of using L1.....	34
2.10.	General Motivation for Code-switching.....	35
2.11.	Functions of code switching: English teachers	36
2.12.	Functions of code switching: students	47

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1.	Overview.....	52
3.2.	Participants.....	52
3.3.	Data collection.....	54
3.4.	Procedure.....	55
3.5.	Coding functions.....	57

Chapter4: Results

4.1.	Overview.....	66
4.2.	The types and functions of CS made by English teachers.....	66

4.2.2.	Functions of teacher code switching.....	68
4.3.	The types and functions of CS made by students in EFL classes	72
4.3.1.	Functions of students' code switching	74
4.4.	The difference between the functions of code switching made by EFL teachers and learners.....	78
4.5.	The relationship between the frequency of CS made by English teachers and the language proficiency of their students	79
4.6.	The relationship between the language proficiency level of the students and their use of code switching.....	80

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

5.1.	Overview.....	82
5.1.1.	Types of CS for teachers and students	82
5.1.2.	Functions of CS: teachers	84
5.1.3.	Functions of CS: Students	90
5.2.	Conclusion.....	94
5.3.	Pedagogical implementations	96
5.4.	Suggestion for further research	98
	References.....	99

List of Tables:

Table 3.1: The teachers' biographical information and their course/lessons specifications.....	53
Table 3.2: The characteristics of the students	54
Table 3.3: Coding functions for teacher CS.....	60
Table 3.4: Examples for each function (teachers)	61
Table 3.5: functions of student CS.....	63
Table 3.6: Examples for each function (students)	64
Table 4.1: Types of switching in teachers talk	67
Table 4.2: Frequency of the total and the two main categories by each teacher	69
Table 4.3: Frequency of the use of two main categories and their subcategories (teacher A).....	69
Table 4.4: Frequency of the use of two main categories and their subcategories (teacher B).....	70
Table4.5: Types of switching in students talk	73
Table 4.6: Frequency of the total and the two main categories by students of each class	75
Table 4.7: Frequency of the use of subcategories by students of each class	76
Table 4.8: Comparison of pedagogical functions for teachers and students	78
Table 4.9: Comparison of social functions for teachers and students.....	79

List of graphs:

Graph 4.1: Types of switching in teachers talk	67
Graph 4.2: Frequency of the use of two main categories and their subcategories for both teachers	71
Graph 4.3: Types of switching in students talk	73
Graph 4.4: Frequency of the total and the two main categories by students of each class	75
Graph 4.5: Frequency of the use of subcategories by students of each class ..	77

Chapter one:

Introduction

1.1. Introduction

Code switching (hereafter CS), which may be briefly defined as the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation (Grosjean, 1982; Milroy & Muysken, 1995) has attracted much attention in last decades. As a common occurrence in ESL/EFL teaching /learning process, CS can be “evidenced along the entire continuum of proficiency” (Brice, 2000). Studies seem to suggest that teacher and student CS, whether in teacher-led classroom discourse or in teacher-student interaction, may be a language strategy serving a variety of pedagogical purposes.

Many researchers devote their attention to bilingual classroom CS of various types, while there are only a few studies of CS in the foreign language classroom. In the second language acquisition (SLA) context, CS has turned out to be a more complicated issue since the foreign language is both the means and the end of the classroom communication (Qian, Tian, & Wang, 2009). While in sociolinguistics CS has been described as a skilled performance, in SLA it has been looked upon as a symptom of error and lack of competence (Belz, 2002).

Classroom CS can be looked upon from both historical and socio-affective perspectives. From the historical viewpoint, some of the most widely used teaching methodologies, such as Direct method and Audiolingualism, have claimed that students' L1 must be avoided in the classroom for the sake of better language learning (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). This claim is mainly based on two psycholinguistic justifications: the first one originates from an analogy between L1 and L2 learning implying that like children who acquire their first language without the help of any other linguistic code, L2 learners must experience the same situation if they want to be successful. However, such an analogy is based on a wrong comparison because L2 learners have an already built linguistic system which is not possessed by L1 learners. The second justification stems from the notion of language compartmentalization and suggests that L1 and L2 exist as separate systems in bilinguals' brain and that the application of L1 in L2 learning hinders rather than helps the process (Saville-Troike, 2006).

From the socio-affective point, the proponents of the exclusive use of the target language believe that it makes the language real for the students and helps them experience unpredictability and develop their in-built language system (Macaro, 2001;

Mugla & Seedhouse, 2005). Moreover, it leads to greater motivation on the part of the students because they see the immediate use of the target language to fulfill their needs (Turnbull & Arnet, 2002). It also maximizes the exposure to the target language, especially in the EFL settings where students have little contact with the FL outside the classroom (Cook, 2001). The studies conducted on teacher CS from such a perspective (e.g., Duff & Polio, 1990) proposed a *virtual position* (Macaro, 2001) according to which the class is like the L2 community and nobody, including the teacher, is supposed to speak in the L1. The outcome of these studies was prescribing some guidelines for minimizing the use of the L1 in the classroom (Mugla & Seedhouse, 2005).

Fortunately, language teaching profession has outgrown such simplistic views toward the use of L1 in the classroom. On the one hand, it is now stated that the exclusive use of the L1 by itself does not guarantee successful L2 learning. Edstorm (2006), for example, proposes that the excessive use of the target language might play the role of a demotivator as students find it redundant, especially when they are engaged in negotiation of meaning. Furthermore, Philipson (1992) adopts a political stance toward the issue and claims that the exclusive use of the target language has been a

strategy used by western colonizers to exercise linguistic imperialism. On the other hand, language teaching experts believe that the careful use of L1 can be an instrument in the hand of teachers to promote student learning (Atkinson, 1993; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989; Cook, 2001; Macaro, 2005). In addition, according to Atkinson (1987), we should not ignore the value of the use of L1 in the classroom because it is not only the preferred strategy for students to surmount their obstacles of speaking in the target language, but also a humanistic approach to permit learners express their feelings and an efficient way for saving time. Also, the use of the L1 provokes discussion and speculation, develops clarity and flexibility of thinking, facilitates teachers and students' relationships, and increases their awareness of the inevitable interaction between the first language and the FL (Harbord, 1992). Research studies that have scrutinized teacher CS from such a perspective are closer to the optimal position which states that L1 has some value in the learning process and should be utilized in the appropriate time and place (Macaro, 2001). These investigations have tended to describe non-judgmentally when and how teachers code switch in the classroom, rather than prescribe what they ought to do to reduce the amount of the L1 use.

1.2. Statement of the problem

The phenomenon of CS in multilingual and bilingual communities became the focus of interest in recent researches. Investigations on classroom CS have been carried out in a broader variety of language environment, from bilingual classrooms, to second language learning classroom, and recently, to foreign language learning classroom. Different approaches and models are defined and it is investigated at different levels of language such as syntax, discourse and analyzed based on social and extra linguistic factors. Although much attention has been paid to the functions and reasons of CS in bilingual context, the importance of CS in ELT classroom and its effect on learning is somehow ignored. In the present study, the functions of CS from teacher and student perspectives through two different levels of proficiency are examined and discussed. This study highlights the effectiveness of CS by representing different approaches and models on this phenomenon. Many of these findings on L1 and L2 use are based on periodic observations in L2 and FL classrooms. By looking at two teachers L1 use over the course of an entire semester, the present study provides a longitudinal perspective.

The kind of research problem addressed in this study is to determine the functions,

types and frequencies of CS in the teachers and students discourse in ELT classrooms. Specifically, this study by providing a qualitative and quantitative analysis of its linguistic features, the functions of its occurrence and frequencies is going to investigate teacher and student CS between English and Persian in EFL classroom.

1.3. Research questions

CS is not only an interesting phenomenon in bilingual environments, but can also be very common in foreign language learning/teaching settings. Most research on teacher and student CS has been originated in contexts quite different from EFL classroom. English is taught in Iran mainly as a subject at school and seldom practiced in the broad social environment. Foreign language teachers and students are frequently observed to employ the alternation of the mother tongue and the target language, i.e., CS in the classrooms. One may wonder how the teachers and students switch codes and what specific pedagogical purposes or functions CS serves in EFL classroom. The purpose of the present study is to describe the CS patterns occurring in teachers' and students' utterances and explain the functions of switches in the EFL classroom setting, therefore, is to provide answers to the following questions: