



Pedagogic and Social Functions of University EFL Teachers' Classroom Code-switching

Qian Xiaofang

Department of English, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

Email address:

qianxiaofang@bnu.edu.cn

To cite this article:

Qian Xiaofang. Pedagogic and Social Functions of University EFL Teachers' Classroom Code-switching. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 5, No. 6, 2017, pp. 179-186. doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20170506.13

Received: September 6, 2017; **Accepted:** October 4, 2017; **Published:** December 7, 2017

Abstract: This study attempts to study classroom code-switching with the focus on code-switching of university teachers of teaching English as the foreign language and teachers of using English mainly as the instructional language. The research methods are mainly ethnographic observations of four participants. It was found that three types of code-switching patterns were identified in the study across the participants. The four teachers switched between English and Chinese for pedagogical considerations. Code-switching also served to adjust teacher-learner relationship. The research findings show that codeswitching can be utilized by teachers as a useful and effective pedagogical and social strategy, which enriches the communicative repertoire and pedagogical resources.

Keywords: Codeswitching, Classroom Codeswitching, Teacher Talk, EFL Classroom Instruction

1. Introduction

There is a return of discussion of using the first language (L1) in second language (L2) or foreign language (FL) instructions in recent years (He, 2012) and the study of code-switching in code-switching has regained attention. Originally the phenomenon of code switching was incorporated into the study of language choice and regarded as resulted from incompetence of speakers. It attracted researchers' attention and was studied independently from the 1960's. Researchers from various disciplines, including anthropology, sociology, psychology, linguistics, showed increasing interest in the language contact phenomenon of code-switching. In the 1970's many researchers turned to the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic studies of code-switching, relating code-switching to its social environment as well as personal motivations underlying the code choices. A great number of code-switching studies focused on macro-distribution or micro-description of code-switching of certain speech communities or the society in general. At the same time, there were researchers who were oriented to code-switching in specific contexts, such as classrooms.

The foreign language classrooms were regarded as a unique speech community (Simon, 2001), where the status of foreign language vs. native language could be attributed to the very

fact that foreign language is the subject matter and the means, or the supposed or imposed means to accomplish its successful mastery. Code choices in both types of classrooms, that is, classroom code-switching of English as the foreign language and English as the instructional language, however, will be investigated in this study and compared in hope that some differing features might be found. This paper intends to investigate on code-switching between Chinese and English in the classroom, including classes of English as the foreign language and English as the instructional language, focusing on non-native teachers' code-switching behavior.

2. Classroom CS Studies

Classroom code-switching study draws on research on classroom interaction, second language acquisition, teacher talk, conversational analysis, pragmatics and the ethnography of communication. Classroom code-switching studies have developed from the study of the distribution of the first language and the foreign language (sometimes a dialect) to the micro-ethnographic study of classroom discourse. Early studies focused on influence of codeswitching in bilingual classroom communication on children's linguistic development and aimed to investigate educational outcomes of linguistic contribution. They were quantitative in nature, in

response to questions about occupation of each language present in the classroom and its use for speech acts and relevance to the management of interaction. Alternating between two languages, even of almost equal proportion, was considered negative on students' first language development.

Later studies paid more attention to linguistic elements in discourse functions of classroom interaction and how teachers and students fulfill tasks with two languages. They identified communicative types in which language the acts are performed and values conveyed through teacher's patterns of bilingual communication. For example, in the study of a twelfth-grade civics class in San Jose, California, Milk (1981) found that the only communication act realized nearly equally was elicitation by the Mexican-American teacher. All the other acts were predominated by use of English, which had the highest frequency in directives and meta statements. The predominance of English in directives was due to the fact that English was the language of power and authority in class. And the use of English in meta statement was for the purpose of displaying the structure and aim of the lesson.

In the more recent studies of classroom code-switching, the focus has shifted to the ways teachers and learners achieve mutual synchronization of behavior in different types of bilingual teaching events. One study in this line was conducted by Lin (1988, 1990) cited by Martin-Jones (1995) in the English language classes in Anglo-Chinese secondary schools in Hong Kong. Code-switching between Cantonese and English frequently occurred in the teacher-led interaction in the four classes, which was ascribed to the difficulty of understanding and using English on the part of the learners. Highly ordered pattern of Cantonese use was noted in the classes, especially in teaching English vocabulary and grammar. The ethnographic approach to classroom interaction has proved effective in analyzing classroom discourse. In the 1990's researchers start to employ this approach.

As far as Chinese and English are concerned, the survey of 15 EFL teachers in 10 colleges and universities (Song, 2005) found that only 2 of the teachers use English all throughout their lessons while teaching basic courses for the ESP (English for Special Purposes) Section. The rest of them apply more or less a mixed form of English and Chinese. It further identified the distribution of L1 and TL in five domains of teacher talk: activity organization, explanation, modeling, questioning and feedback. The analysis of the five teachers' talk yielded the result that those teachers code-switched most frequently in explanations especially when explaining vocabulary. They switched least frequently when modeling and organizing the class.

While analyzing classroom discourse in Finnish EFL teenager classrooms (i.e. where English is the object of study) and CLIL classrooms (i.e. Content and Language Integrated Learning where non-language subjects are taught in English), Nikula (2005) finds differences between the two contexts that point toward their discursive practices being differently placed on the pragmatic dimensions of detachment versus

involvement. The overall tendency in the EFL classrooms is to reserve the role of English mainly to engage in materials-dependent talk, whilst in CLIL classrooms English is used for virtually all official and non-official classroom activities. In EFL discourse things were usually dealt with from a more impersonal and distant "s/he-they-there-then" deictic perspective, characters and events described in the materials being the focus of attention rather than participants' own concern. Participants often resorted to Finnish to add to impressions of solidarity and informality. Speakers in CLIL settings, however, tend to operate from a more immediate "I/we-you-here-now" deictic perspective, and there was a greater sense of personal investment and immediacy in the learning situations.

Many of the studies cited above involve the foreign language classroom discourse (Lin, 1990), but they did not make any distinction between ordinary bilingual classrooms and foreign language classrooms. Communication in foreign language classroom is multi-layered and more difficult to analyze than social code-switching (Simon, 2001). The primary goal of communication in this context is to facilitate learning. The participants in foreign language classroom can be regarded as a speech community. In terms of verbal repertoire, the speakers in such a context are characterized by the unequal mastery of the linguistic codes in contact. The learners are generally less proficient in the target language, while the teacher has more knowledge in this respect. The very purpose of communicative exchanges is to reduce the asymmetrical mastery over the foreign language as the learners move towards the more proficient end of the code.

Simon's (2001) study in the foreign language classrooms found that the native language is generally used for grammatical explanations, cultural information an sometimes instructions about what to do, and foreign language for oral production tasks, comprehension and lexical explanations. And these are unmarked choices for such task types. Through the study, Simon concludes that code-switching is a precious pedagogical resource. Teachers and learners draw on their linguistic resources to ensure efficiency in their communicative strategies. Code choices enable them to express their personal opinions, thoughts, ideas and feelings adequately. Specifically, for the teacher, code-switching serves to ensure maximum understanding, or to shift to a more informal social level of communication with learners to gain cooperation or to clarify the task of instructions. It is commonly found in Chinese EFL classrooms, but most teachers hold negative attitudes towards their use of L1 (Cheng, 2013). Therefore it is necessary to look into the class code-switching closely and investigate if such switching serves any functions.

3. Research Design

3.1. Research Questions

This study intends to address the following research questions:

1. How do university EFL teachers switch between English and Chinese in their classrooms?
2. What pedagogic and social functions do these switches serve in their classroom instruction?

3.2. Research Context

The present study is situated in an English department of a comprehensive university in Beijing, which has under-graduate, postgraduate students and doctoral candidates. This is an exolingual setting, that is to say, the foreign language is not a language of the environment (Simon, 2001). Undergraduate students of lower levels take courses of general English skills. The upper level students continue to take a few advanced language training courses

and more courses in fields like literature and linguistics. The postgraduates in Applied Linguistics take courses in Linguistics and applied linguistics, etc. There are about 20 to 30 students in each undergraduate class of lower levelers and 30 to 60 students of upper levels. They are expected to master the foreign language and use it effectively and efficiently.

3.3. Participants

Four teachers, one female and three male (as shown in Table 1) participated in the study. Two of them were exclusively engaged in teaching undergraduates, Wen Chen and Su Hong. They were selected because they were noticed to have switched to Chinese inside and outside classrooms.

Table 1. Personal Information About the Participants.

Participants	Courses	Student level	Years of teaching	Specialty
Mr. Li Gang	TEFL Methodology	Juniors post graduates	10 years	Language teaching
Mr. Wen Chen	Comprehensive English Advanced Reading	Juniors (2 classes) Juniors (1 class)	6 years	Literature
Ms. Su Hong	Comprehensive English	Freshmen	10 years	Linguistics
Ms. Pu Tian	Grammar	Postgraduates	12 years	Linguistics

Su Hong usually organized a variety of communicative activities and sometimes concentrated taught grammar and vocabulary in her Comprehensive English class. Wen Chen taught Comprehensive English to forty juniors and Advanced Reading In class he was engaged in explaining background knowledge of the text or its author, comprehension of the text, including difficult phrases and sentences as well as the meaning conveyed in the text. Li Gang was responsible for teaching TEFL Methodology to undergraduates of more than seventy students. Apart from lecturing, he constantly involves students in discussions. Pu Tian taught Functional Grammar class for first-year postgraduates. The style of his class of Functional Grammar could be portrayed as lecturing accompanied by discussion. During the weeks of observation, the researcher partly participated in the class and felt that his

lessons were not easy, as shared by some of his students informed through informal talks. This actually turned to be one major trigger for his code switches.

3.4. Data Collection and Analysis

The data collection methods mainly comprise ethnographic classroom observation, audio recording and interviews. The actual collection lasted for about 3 months.

The teachers were all interviewed, either during the break or at the end of observation. The interviews were unstructured and not so formal concerning when they thought they switched to Chinese, what they had in mind when they code-switched generally and for some particular switches.

Table 2. Distribution of Types of Code-switching.

Participants	Tag-switching	Intra-sentential switching	Inter-sentential switching	Total number of switches
Li Gang	0	11	19	30
Wen Chen	0	38	20	58
Su Hong	10	65	11	86
Pu Tian	9	62	24	95
Total	19	176	74	269

The data collection yielded 269 examples of code switches throughout the total of forty-four hours of classroom observation. Seventy of them are switches to Chinese embedded in long utterances of English and 199 are switches to English in large chunks of Chinese. Concerning the types of code-switching identified, the numbers of tag-switching, intra-sentential switching and inter-sentential switching are 19, 176, and 74 respectively (see Table 2). It is clear that intra-sentential switching has the highest number among the total of code switches. It has especially high frequencies in Su Hong and Pu Tian, for the former had the habit of

explaining new words or phrases in Chinese and the latter had a large number of academic terms to introduce to learners.

4. Findings

4.1. Pedagogic Functions

Teachers in the study were found to switch between English and Chinese to ensure maximum effect of teaching, in other words, they code-switched for pedagogical reasons, in contrast with the intention to adjust teacher-student

relationship via code-switching.

4.1.1. Translation

It could be found in many examples in which the teachers translated some language points, mainly new words or phrases, i.e. “proposal”, “wedding reception” and “Almighty God” that they wanted students to grasp to facilitate comprehension

Example 1: (Pu Tian, Functional Grammar)

T: He talked about through “ranked constituents analysis” *jijie fenxifa* (hierarchical analysis) in terms of minimal bracketing. I don’t know if you have still remembered we learnt Immediate Constituents Analysis? *Zhijie chengfen fenxifa* (immediate constituent analysis). What is Immediate Constituents Analysis? How to do the analysis? An instance here. We have all the bracketing, bracketing, *qiefen fangshi* (ways of segmenting) right?

In such translations, the teacher considered it important for students to know the equivalents of these terms in both languages so that they could associate what they were learning with their past knowledge. It was considered necessary for graduate students to know some terms in both languages for academic reasons.

4.1.2. Clarification

Teachers are often engaged in clarification of specific points. It differs from translation in that on some occasions the very purpose of translation is to give a translation for a word, or a term in particular, as illustrated in the example above. The focus of teacher’s intention to clarify a message is to switch to L1 with further explanation. Such functions can be realized in intra-sentential switches. For instance, Su Hong provided translation “*laji youjian* (junk mail)” and “*jiedaihui*” (reception) for the two points “junk mail” and “wedding reception”, and then she proceeded to explain them further in Chinese, “*jiushi yongyu guanggao de youjian*” (mails for commercial purposes) and “*yejiushi jiehun qingke shenme*” (stuff just like wedding receptions).

Example 2: (Li Gang, TEFL Methodology, undergraduate class)

T: We Chinese hold the dead of the importance, of the important position, the important position. *Huanhuhuashuo, Jiaozuo “sizhe weida”, shenme shihou ni yede zunzhong sizhe. Huoren dou gubu guolai* (In other words, the deceased is regarded as most important”, you’ve got to take care of the dead, well, we cannot even take good care of the living... (smile)

Another example is also found in Li Gang’s class. It can be also manifested in inter-sentential switches, where the teacher used two or more sentences to clarify a point, as shown in Example 2. Here the teacher clarified the message in Chinese and gave a side comment, which showed his understanding of this Chinese ethics and attitudes towards it.

Example 3: (Li Gang, TEFL Methodology, undergraduate class)

T: What’s the Chinese for the “reflection” here?

Ss: *Fansi* (Reflection).

T: *Fansi, fansi, fansixing xuexi. Gangcai women tidaole*

“*xueer busi zewang, si eribuxue zedai*”, *jiushiyao ianzuo bianxue. Xianzaide shuyu jiao “fansi”, zhege gainian qishi yingg shi yiyangde* (Reflection, reflection, reflective teaching. Just now we mentioned “Learning without thinking leads to confusion, and thinking without learning leads to idleness”, that means learning and doing at the same time. The idea is actually the same.)

In Example 3 Li Gang’s extension of the idea of reflection is first made clear by asking students for the Chinese equivalent. The idea is elaborated in the quote from Confucius, to convey the meaning that we need to reflect on ourselves, as explicitly expressed in the traditional doctrine. During interviews the teacher explained that he thought this switch very well served his purpose of urging students to reflect. At the same time, he drew their attention through switching to L1. He withdrew from extending the concept in Chinese, for he considered that there should be some room left for students to think independently.

4.1.3. Highlighting

It was found that teachers used code-switching as a strategy to get students’ attention, i.e. to emphasize a point of significance in the teacher’s mind. They intended to digress from the current topic, which triggered another issue. The issue was considered so important that the teacher initiated it in L1 to draw their attention to it. Such switches involved multiple sentences, and most likely inter-sentential switches.

Example 4: (Pu Tian, Functional Grammar)

T: Ok, first, the name of the course is “Systemic Functional Grammar: the Structure of Semantics”. Is everyone have a copy, now? *Shibushi meigeren dou nadao zheben, maidao zhebenshu le? Ernianji de tongxue geiwo Kankan. Biezhaojia. Zanmen shangyue jiudao shudian geinimen lianxi, mei lianxishang. Xiegeyue jiudaole. Buyong zhaoji. Douyao Han Lidedel guohuier wo jiugei nimen jieshao. Zheshi yibenshu, lingyiben shi rumenshu. Dajia xiaqu fanyifan, jiushi HuZhuanglin, Zhu Yongsheng, Zhang Delu bianzhude. Zheshi liangben bijiao guanjiande shu, near yeyou, wo gen tamen shuohaole, meiweni.* (Has everyone got the book? You bought the book? Can the second year students showme the book? Don’t worry. We tried to order the books for you from the bookstore last month, but we couldn’tcontact them successfully. But next month the books will arrive. We all need Halliday’s book. I’ll introduce him in a moment. This is one book, and another book is an introduction. IF you have a look, you see it’s the one written by HuZhuanglin, Zhu Yongsheng, and Zhang Delu. These are two most important books for this cours. They got that one there. I’ve talked with them, there’s no problem about it. Alright, let’s go on. The course description first. First is the aim of the course... (English hereafter)

The teacher in Example 4 switched to Chinese to draw students’ attention to the point that reading is considered very important for graduate students. He highlighted it in L1 in case of any misunderstanding or loss of message. The remarks related to issues about the purchasing matter of the books showed the teacher’s deep concern for the students. At

the same time, he was shifting to another language to move out of the teaching frame. In the interview he explained that sometimes he did not mind whether he was teaching graduate students in English or Chinese. And he assured that he never or seldom switched to Chinese when teaching undergraduates. English, Chinese or the mixed utterances were all natural in the graduate class, for input in the foreign language was not of the uppermost concern for them.

The switches of highlighting are distinguished from other types for the awareness and deliberateness of code-switching on the part of the speaker. The teacher told the researcher that he was switching deliberately to achieve his goal:

“Students have probably watched the play ‘Ju zi hong le’ (‘Oranges Reddened’). Quoting the exact words can attract their attention and their interest. At the same time, the original words can express my meaning more accurately. Also, speaking in their words can eliminate the intense atmosphere in class. After all, we share the same language”. (Interview, Li Gang)

This very act of codeswitching embodies the function of highlighting as well as the social functions of encouragement and showing solidarity with students. Codeswitching applied by the teachers effectively and efficiently enabled the teacher to fulfill teaching tasks.

4.1.4. For Efficiency

When speakers are in pressing situations, they may switch to their native language to express their ideas. That is, they need to save time, and sometimes efforts and communicate their intention and ensure the maximum of communication. This is exactly what happens in the next example.

Example 5: (Su Hong, Comprehensive English)

T: *Zai kan dianyinga, dengyixia zou, kanyixia zuoye.* (To see a film? Hold on, take a look at the assignment.) Exercise two. *Zhelim youge wenti* (There’s a question here): “Do you know anything about C... (unclear) Road?” *Zhexianm shi yige cail, liaojie yixia.* (There’s some material, let’s look at it). *Dickens de zuopin* (‘s work), *Dickens de zuopin* (‘s work). *Dierge wenti, wo yougei dajia jiale yige* (The second question, I added one more here): After watching the film, write something about the film. *Ruguo ni butai mingbai de hua, ni keyi* (If you don’t understand, you can) find some books. Ok, and finally and I think it is the most difficult work. *Yibai ershiyi ye dao yibai ershier ye, zhe bushi you liangge bufen ma?* (From page one hundred twenty one to page one hundred twenty two, aren’t there two parts?)

Ss: *Hehe* (Yeah).

T: *Zhe liangge bufen, zuoyixia fanyi.* (These two parts, translate them.)

Ss: *A?* (Really?) ?

T: *Fanyi yixia zheyike, ganyi yixia, haoma?* (Translate this lesson, translate it, ok?)

This event happened at the beginning of the class. When the students knew that they were going to watch a film, they were getting very excited and the class was chaotic. To get students’ attention to the assignment and let every student catch the message, the teacher chose L1 as the instructional

language. At the moment of turmoil, or in the teacher’s words “the pressing moment”, it was more convenient and easier, and surely more efficient, to communicate her intent to the students in the L1 of both the speakers and audience. “I switched from English to Chinese because it was pressing. Chinese is the mother tongue and much easier”, Su Hong explained. She added, “Sometimes I announce a notice in Chinese, because if it is much easier. And if it is said in English, there might be some misunderstanding”. Switch to achieve efficiency was also an important category identified in Zhao (2000), where many examples demonstrated that the teachers chose Chinese as the means to instruct the course when explaining grammar, which is a common practice in foreign language classrooms, as informed by Su Hong in the interview.

4.1.5. Qualification of Message

There is another important function code-switching serves, that is, to qualify a message, as identified by Gumperz (1982). Quotations and reading from written material normally qualify a message, in addition to distinguishing between direct and reported speech. In Example 6 the first switch is just a translation of a special name, but the second switch implies an equivalent in Chinese. This time the teacher did not take the trouble to translate it first into English.

Example 6: (Wen Chen, Advanced Reading)

T: What is “the Almighty God”?

S1: *Wannengde shangdi* (The Almighty God).

T: In Chinese, *women zhongguoren shuo*: “*Toushan shanchi you shenming*”. *Sanchi goudezha?* (We Chinese say, “There are spirits and gods three feet above us. Can we reach it above three feet?)

Ss: ... (laugh)

To facilitate better understanding of the theme implied in the texts, the teacher often related them to similar ethics conveyed in Chinese culture or literature. And it was no doubt more convenient to talk about Chinese cultures in the Chinese language.

4.2. Social Functions

The analysis above focuses on the functions and motivations of code-switching from the considerations of pedagogical reasons. This is where classroom code-switching of the teacher differs from social code-switching, as proved by Simon (2001). In these cases, the teachers were most concerned about the teaching effect. The code-switching instances also imply social effects in terms of increasing or decreasing social distance (Myers-Scotton, 1993). Teachers used code-switching as strategies to establish or reestablish certain relationships. The four participants were all found to use code-switching to encourage students, to achieve humorous effect, express dissatisfaction and show solidarity with students.

4.2.1. Encouragement

Li Gang explicitly encouraged his students to speak out the truth in one lesson. He explained that TV viewers liked the

Lord in the play for his tolerance of truth-speaking “*jiangshihua*” (to tell the truth). He proposed that the students follow the example of the characters in the drama to vent their true feelings “*qishi women yinggai tichang zhezhong...*” (In fact we should promote this kind of ...). The process was done in the switch to their shared L1 and it proved effective that some students did say what they thought about the topic whether they found learning English interesting or not. Pu Tian clearly encouraged the graduate students of functional grammar to participate in academic studies for there still was hope ahead of them, as shown in the underlined sentences. Many scholars had already set examples for them.

Example 7: (Pu Tian, Functional Grammar)

T:... (Soyi juname huishi. Suoyi women meigeren dou henyong yiwang, women zhege xueke suo lim you henduoren doushi fenfa erqide. Er zheli meigeren haidouyou yisi xiwang. Haiyou Guo Hong, Nanjing guoji guanxi xueyuande, Yang Chaoguang, shi ... (unclear) guoji daxuede. Zhang Deli, shi henan daxuede, he, Zhou Zhongjie, shi shanghai daxuede, Zhou Shichang, shi shanghai, shanghai nage daxuede? Zhaxie you henduoren doushi bodao, doushi mingrena, baokuo yixie houqizhixiu. Haiyou yxie, zhe jiushi beidade Jiang QwANGQI, zanmen shidade Yang... (unclear) zuijin ye jiaru zhege hanglie laile (So it is just like that, so I think everyone of us is full of hope. Many people in this area work hard and succeed. So everyone of us is hopeful. These include Guo Hong, from Nanjing International Relation Studies University, Yang Chaoguang, from... (unclear) International Studies University. Zhang Deli, he's from Henan University, an D, Zhou Shijie, he's from Shanghai University. Zhou Shichang, he's from Shanghai, what Shanghai university? Many of them are Ph. D advisors, some of them are very young and accomplished. And there are people like Jiang Wangqi from Beijing University, and Yang... from our Normal University... They recently joined us.) Anyway...

The teacher chose Chinese as the code to encourage students instead of using English, the more emotionally distant code, which might not achieve such strong affective ties between teacher and students. They were using code-switching as a social strategy as well as a pedagogic strategy.

As pointed out by researchers like Martin-Jones (1995), English is the language of authority and power in the foreign language classrooms, and classrooms having English as the instructional language as well. The asymmetrical relationship between teachers and learners is due to the fact that the unequal mastery of the foreign language exists between the two parties. However, they share the same native language, which is also the community language. Chinese is nearly invariably spoken by all the teachers and students after class. The speakers in the two examples achieved solidarity through switching to the shared code.

4.2.2. Humor

It was noticed the symbol “...” with “(laugh)” appeared several times in the instances. This is the transcription

convention the researcher applied to indicate laughter, usually produced by students. Some of the laughter occurred because of the teacher's switch triggered by situational factors.

Example 8: (Wen Chen, Advanced Reading)

T: The soldiers did not have boots to wear. The boots were too small... *You zheme yige xiao gushi* (There's a story). There was a boy in our class. His head was very big. *Suoyi zai junxun de shihou, nage maozi ta daishangqu dou taidale* (So during the military training, whichever hat he wore would be too small for him). The hat was like a small lid on his head. Small lid, *jiushi xiao chahugai, tade naidai taidale* (just like a small lid, his head was far too big).

Ss: ... (laugh)

Side comments made by teachers would also cause students to laugh. For instance, Li Gang's comment in Example 2 “*huoren dou gu buguolai*” (we cannot even take good care of the living) on the idea of “*sizhe weida, shenme shihou ni yedei zunzhong sizhe*” (the dead is regarded the most important, no matter when, you've got to respect the dead) made students burst into laughter. It seemed to him that it was somehow ridiculous to put the dead at the uppermost position when the living could not take good care of themselves. Students' response in the form of laughing implied that they agreed on it to some degree. It seemed that Wen Chen was cynical towards some traditional doctrines. In Example 6 above the side comment “*sanchi goudezha*” (Is three feet enough to reach that?) achieved humorous effect, and again in Example 8. The classroom atmosphere then became more relaxed. The distance between teacher and students was shortened.

4.2.3. Solidarity

A number of examples appeared previously have proved that teacher's switch to Chinese, the language both the teacher and students had equal mastery, could achieve solidarity. For instance, when the teachers encouraged students or pleased them with humorous remarks in Chinese, their students felt the teacher was not so distant. The following Example 9 also demonstrates the teacher's effort to achieve solidarity with his students through sharing his own view of Beijing's weather.

Example 9: (Li Gang, TEFL Methodology)

T: Class begins. Beijing shi ge haodifang. Beijing shenem douyou, nanfang youde Beijing you, Beijing, beifang youde Beijing yeyou. Dongbei youde Beijing yeyou. Beijing shige haodifang. Wangnan buneng zaizoule. Beijing shige haodifang, nimen tongyima? (Beijing is a good place, Beijing has everything. Beijing has what the South has, what the North has, and what the Northeast has. Beijing is a good place, cannot go southward any more. Do you agree?)

S:... (showing disagreement)

T: I was not born in Beijing. But I... and I think it is beautiful. Ok, now, back to methodology.

This example was extracted from the beginning of the lesson. On that day, there was a severe sandstorm in Beijing and yellow sands overwhelmed the whole city, which looked

horrible and several students were looking outside intensely. When the teacher was making the comment, the sky was totally hued yellow. A slight hint of cynicism could be detected from the teacher's switch in Chinese. But the deliberate choice of language suggested that the teacher was also concerned with the environment, as his students did.

4.2.4. Dissatisfaction

Example 10: (Wen Chen, Comprehensive English)

T: I think you have learnt Pygmalion. Bernard Shaw, right? Bernard Shaw? Anybody has heard about the story Pygmalion?

Ss: ... (silence for 12 seconds)

T: *Jiu nimen zheyang, gei nimen huazhongdian wo jue de duoyu, bugei nimen huazhongdianle* (Look at what you are now, I don't think it necessary for me to tell you the important review points, I won't tell you the key points.) ... Pygmalion, the story starts ... (English hereafter)

Only one example has been found in the corpus of the four participants' code-switching to express personal feelings towards students. After asking a question in English, the teacher abruptly switched to Chinese, instead of using the foreign language, the language of more authority, to show his dissatisfaction towards students' null response. However, it might be said that the teacher was applying the native language to show concerns for the students. If he had criticized them in the foreign language, which is culturally and psychologically more remote, he would otherwise distance the students, indicating the superior status of the teacher and eliminating his concerns for the students.

4.3. Discussion

The discussion focuses on the multiple functions of teachers' code-switching and the similarities and differences among teachers of the two types of classrooms, that is, teachers of English as the foreign language and teachers of English as the instructional language.

4.3.1. Multiple Functions

The functions of code-switching have been classified into the two general categories, and it is obvious that many examples overlap in the description. First of all, it has to be admitted that the pedagogical functions the switches have are not absolute. They are interrelated. For instance, Wen Chen applied two quotes "*weizhi si yanzhi sheng*" (If we don't know death how can we know live) and "*toushang sanchi you qingtian*" (There is heaven three feet above us) to clarify the points conveyed in the previous utterances, related to the theme in the text. As a matter of fact, in one passage of speech the speaker might have integrated both pedagogical motivations and social motivations. The side comment Wen Chen made "*huoren dou gubu guolai*" (we cannot even take good care of the living) following the clarification of the quotes had humorous effects. A similar case is found in Li Gang when he qualified a phrase "to tell the truth" and encouraged students to tell the truth. Pu Tian switched to Chinese for efficiency and encouraged his students as well.

4.3.2. English as Foreign Language vs. English as Instructional Language

The four participants in the study have been classified as teachers of English as the Foreign Language (Wen Chen and Su Hong) and teachers of English mainly as the Instructional Language (Li Gang and Pu Tian), which corresponds to the distinction between foreign language classroom code-switching and ordinary classroom code-switching made by Simon (2001). Simon's data incorporates both teacher's and learner's switches. She treats foreign language classroom as a special speech community, where the foreign language is both the instrumentality and the objective of communication. But the present study has found no significant differences in the types of CS patterns and functions between the switches the two types of teachers' discourse, although they differ in some aspects.

When Chinese was selected as the unmarked choice, Wen Chen and Pu Tian both chose L1 to carry on the classroom discourse for the concern about efficiency or difficulty level of the topic. Both Wen Chen and Pu Tian tended to maintain the unmarked RO sets, i.e. to make sure that the topic could be discussed into some depth and understood thoroughly. Here the switching to L1 appears similar to what identified as referential strategy by Appel & Muysken (1989), in which the switching involves lack of facility in the foreign language on a certain subject. But here the teachers switched for the sake of their learners to the larger extent, not because they were incapable of talking about the topic in the foreign language.

Every participant applied L1 as the marked code choice, however. First of all, switch patterns of teachers from both categories involve all the three types, namely, tag-switching, intra-sentential switching and inter-sentential switching,, similar to the code-switching in the teachers' utterances in language teacher education classroom (Azlan & Narasuman, 2013). Su Hong' tended to switch within sentence boundaries. She also had the habit of mixing discourse markers from Chinese into English. The switches of the other three teachers were usually much longer and complex. As Dawaele & Zeckel (2015) found occurrences of self-reported code-switching are significantly related to the speakers' personalities like open mindedness and flexibility. We might understand these teachers' code-switching occurrences in relation to their personalities.

In addition, teachers of both teaching English as a foreign language and teaching English as the instructional language were engaged in code switching for clarification, highlighting and efficiency, and all the teachers except Su Hong were found to be often engaged in code switches for social reasons. Wen Chen often told jokes to the class or made humorous side comments and Pu Tian constantly encouraged his students to participate in academic study in Chinese. Li Gang switched to Chinese consciously to comment on some phenomenon related to the topic of the class. Such difference has nothing to do with the type of class the teachers were teaching and can be attributed to their personal style of pedagogy. Therefore, although every teacher varies in their

personal style of code-switching, they are all using it as a resource to facilitate teaching and learning. Code-switching is a communicative tool for language teachers ((Azlan & Narasuman, 2013). In some language contact situations, code-switching can be “a braiding strategy” in either L2 language classrooms or content courses (King & Chetty, 2014). As such, CS can be reliably understood as a purposeful, productive strategy.

5. Conclusion

This study finds that the four university English teachers had no outstanding differences concerning code-switching patterns or the functions the switches served. The three syntactic types of CS, namely, tag-switching, intra-sentential switching and inter-sentential switching were all identified in their classroom utterances. They switched within sentences or clauses or beyond them. They switched wherever they felt the need to do so.

Their code-switching between English and Chinese had pedagogical reasons and social functions. They deviated from the usual instructional language to fulfill certain tasks of teaching. Apart from switching to ensure the optimal effect of teaching and learning, teachers also switch to the shared mother tongue for social reasons. Therefore, one can say that teachers can use code-switching as both pedagogical and social resources. As Simon (2001) advocated, code-switching is an important resource to be tapped by teachers. We could understand such strategic use of code-switching from teachers' identities. The identities of teachers could consist of roles like instructor, facilitator, organizer, supporter and even a friend. But these constellations may be enacted under different circumstances in different ways (Auer, 2005) and code-switching is a handy resource for teachers.

Teachers in classroom circumstances have three linguistic possibilities, as part of the variability of language property (Yu, 2000): purely Chinese, purely English and codeswitching between the two. The third choice, codeswitching between English and Chinese is probably the most reasonable choice for university English teachers. Students' prior knowledge, stored in the mother tongue, is an excellent resource to support learning new knowledge. It has often to be mobilized or triggered by the native language. Naturally, teachers could use code-switching as a pedagogical as well as a social strategy in classrooms, instead of mere interference. When both the teacher and learner share the same L1 and L2, such strategic use of L1 could open up greater pedagogic space and bear constructive implications for L2 instruction (He, 2012).

References

- [1] Appel, R. E., Muysken, P. 1989. *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [2] Auer, P. 2005. A postscript: code-switching and social identity. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37, 403–410.
- [3] Azlan, N. I., Narasuman, S. 2013. The Role of Code-Switching as a communicative tool in an ESL teacher education classroom. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 90, 458 – 467.
- [4] Cheng, X. 2013. Research on Chinese College English Teachers' Classroom Code-switching: Beliefs and Attitudes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 4, No. 6, pp. 1277-1284.
- [5] Dawaele, J., Zeckel, I. 2015. The psychological and linguistic profiles of self-reported code switchers. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 1–17.
- [6] Gumperz, J. J. 1982. *Discourse Strategy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] He, A. E. 2012. Systematic use of mother tongue as learning/teaching resources in target language instruction. *Multilingual Education*, 2:1. <http://www.multilingual-education.com/content/2/1/1>.
- [8] King, J., Chetty, R., 2014. Codeswitching: Linguistic and literacy understanding of teaching dilemmas in multilingual classrooms. *Linguistics and Education* 25, 40-50.
- [9] Martin-Jones, M. 1995. “Code-switching in the classroom: two decades of research. In Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.) *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [11] Nikula, T. (2005). English as an object and tool of study in classrooms: Interactional effects and pragmatic implications. *Linguistics and Education* 16, 27-58.
- [12] Simon, D. 2001. “Towards a new understanding of codeswitching in the foreign language classroom”. In Jacobson, R. (ed.) *Codeswitching Worldwide II. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs* 126. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- [13] Song, H. (2005). Teacher's code-switching in college English classroom teaching. *Journal of Northeastern Agricultural University (Social Science Edition)* 3 (1), 103-105.
- [14] Verchueren, J. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [15] Yu, G. 2000. A pragmatic study of code-switching. *Journal of Foreign Languages* 6, 22-27.