

The Effect of Intra-sentential, Inter-sentential and Tag-sentential Switching on Teaching Grammar

¹Atefeh Abdollahi

¹MA Graduate, Islamic Azad University, Takestan Branch.

Abstract

The present study examined the comparative effect of different types of code-switching, i.e., intra-sentential, inter-sentential, and tag-sentential switching on EFL learners grammar learning and teaching. To this end, a sample of 60 Iranian female and male students in two different institutions in Qazvin was selected. They were assigned to four groups. Each group was randomly assigned to one of the afore-mentioned treatment conditions. After the experimental period, a post-test was taken from students to examine the effect of different types of code-switching on students' learning of grammar. The results showed that the differences among the effects of the above-mentioned techniques were statistically significant. These findings can have implications for EFL learners, EFL teachers, and materials' developers.

Key word: Code, Code switching, Inter-sentential switching, Tag-switching, Inter-sentential switchin.

Background and purpose

Code switching, i.e., the use of more than one language in speech, has been said to follow regular grammatical and stylistic patterns (Woolford, 1983). Patterns of code switching have been described in terms of grammatical constraints and various theoretical models have been suggested to account for such constraints. In general, syntactic models of code switching restrictions are differentiated based on the type of answer they provide to the following questions: 1) Are code switching patterns universal or relevant only to the interaction of specific language pairs? and 2) Is code switching asymmetric?

It is evident that Code-switching is fairly popular in bilingual speech and teaching, and it is therefore not surprising that there has been a great body of research on code-switching. Focusing on this issue, Li (2000) elaborates that code-switching is a typical feature of the speech of bilingual speakers rather than a sign of deficiency. Code-switching is not an indicator of deficient language skills in the bilingual speakers. Different definitions for code switching have been suggested by scholars. For instance, Heller (1988, p.4) defines code switching as "the use of more than one language in the course of a single communication episode." According to Myers-Scotton's (2006, p.239) the general definition of code switching is "the use of two language varieties in the same conversation. The earliest definition of code switching dates back to Weinreich (1953), who defines bilinguals as individuals who switch "from one language to the other according to appropriate changes in speech situation". Code switching as a learning instrument occurs at different levels in classrooms, including a switch of grammatical points i.e. adverbs, verbs and adjectives etc., or technical language and registers. This study will base its categorization of code switching types on Poplack's (1980) work. She identifies three categories for code-switching: intra-sentential switching, inter-sentential switching and tag-switching, which Milroy and Muysken (1995) call extra-sentential switching. Inter-sentential switching is the changes between sentences, one sentence is in one language but next sentence is in another language. Intra-sentential switching is changing the language of one sentence or phrase. Tag switching is inserting a tag from one language to another one.

Using the first language or code-switching can make the acquisition of a second language easier. Many linguists and researchers have given support to grammar instruction in ESL and EFL language teaching and learning. It is believed that using native language is useful in explaining and teaching structural grammar rules. The teacher has more advantages if he knows the students' first language over the teacher who does not know this. For example, Brown (2000) claims that "first language can be a fascinating factor and not just an interfering factor". Schweers (1999) encouraged teachers to include first language to stimulate the class dynamic and suggests, "Starting with L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learner's lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves".

In recent years views about the legitimacy of teacher code-switching in the language classroom have changed, considering it as a useful strategy and formulating a set of pedagogical guidelines for utilizing it in the class based on empirical evidence. Given the fact that no systematic research has been conducted on the Iranian EFL teachers' use of code switching, the present study is conducted in an attempt to investigate teachers' code switching to Persian in the language classroom and to pinpoint various types of code-switching in foreign language classrooms by understanding its effects. As an effort to accumulate empirical evidence in this regard, this study will examine the impact of teacher code-switching on language learners' mastery of grammatical constructions, focusing on the effects of different types of code switching.

Statement of the problem

Macaro (1997) has summarized the attitudes toward teacher code-switching or exclusion of the first language in language classrooms in three words: *virtually all*, *maximal*, and *optimal*. The *virtually all* view is based on the view that the learners' first language (L1) has no value in the class and should be avoided by all means. By the same token, the *maximal* view rules out the role of L1 in foreign language classrooms, although its position is not as extreme as the position taken by the advocates of the *virtually all* view. The optimal view perspective holds the use of L1 has pedagogical value and thus should be emphasized. However, the consensus among the advocates of this perspective is that the use of L1 should not be uncontrolled and instead should be governed by optimal principles and guidelines informed by empirical research.

The first two views are based on questions related to whether the process of learning an L2 is similar to that of L1. If learning an L2 takes the same path as the path taken in the acquisition of L1, then there is ample justification for the exclusion of L1 in language classes. Based on Krashen's (1987) input hypothesis, the prerequisite for acquisition is to maximize comprehensible input (Krashen, 1987). Consequently, the use of L1 should be minimized, if not completely eliminated. The idea is that the use of L1 in L2 classes may lead to the learners' being deprived of valuable target language input. In other words, these views advocate the exclusion of L1 in the L2 classrooms. Thus, the issue of teachers' code-switching in the L2 classroom is very controversial, meriting further investigation.

There are other views that support the facilitative role of code-switching in L2 classes. The three theoretical accounts which advocate the use of L1 include linguistic theory, socio-cultural theory and cognitive theory. According to linguistic theory, code-switching is regarded as part of any bilingual's language competence in both naturalistic settings (Poplack, 1980) and language classrooms (Lin, 1996). The socio-cultural theory is based on the social-cultural aspect of one's thinking and behaviors, stressing the expression of one's inner voice hence legitimizing the use of L1 in L2 classes (Brooks & Donato, 1994). Cognitive theory postulates the existence

of one integrated mental lexicon (Cook 2001), where all mental representations are assumed to be activated by a given stimulus, regardless of whether they were originally created through one language or another (Libben, 2000). This account, thus, advocates the inclusion of L1 in L2 classrooms. Nonetheless, whether code-switching in the L2 classroom is justified cannot be readily clarified without ample empirical evidence regarding the impact of teacher code-switching on L2 learners' mastery of grammatical constructions.

Studies focusing on language teachers' code switching are of importance since there is little research on learners' attitudes towards teachers' code-switching, which is an inevitable part of the input in most L2 classrooms. The lack of research into the students' attitudes has left unexplored the effect of code switching on learning (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). With respect to the paucity of such research, the present research will make an attempt to address teacher code-switching trying to fill an important gap in the literature.

There has been little research done, especially in Iran to examine the three types of code switching on teaching grammar in a single study in EFL classrooms; there are some studies that have been separately done on intra, inter or tag switching but not all together in a single study. As it was mentioned, code switching is used in teaching grammar but there is little information as to which of these three types is of the highest effect in teaching grammar. One of the main problems in teaching grammar is that some teachers speak only in the target language while teaching a grammar and as a consequence some of students do not understand the input especially in elementary or intermediate levels. It is plausible to argue that if learners do not get the grammatical points, sometimes the teachers use their native language.

Research questions

The purpose of the present study is to provide an answer to the following questions:

- 1) Does intra-sentential switching have a significant effect on EFL learners' grammar learning as compared to instruction based on no code-switching?
- 2) Does inter-sentential switching have a significant effect on EFL learners' grammar learning as compared to instruction based on no code-switching?
- 3) Does tag-sentential switching have a significant effect on EFL learners' grammar learning as compared to instruction based on no code-switching?
- 4) What kind of code-switching has the highest effect on EFL learners' grammar learning?
- 5) What are the Iranian EFL learners' attitudes towards switching to Farsi in English classes?

Significance of the study

Valdes-Fallis (1981) states that code-switching may be defined as the changes in using two languages at different levels of word, phrase, clause, or sentence. What is considerable is that little systematic research has been carried out on the effect of switching codes on teaching grammar in the Iranian EFL context. The importance of the present study is that there are few studies in this field, if any, that compare these three types of code-switching (intra-sentential, inter-sentential and tag switching) and their effect on teaching and learning grammar. Thus, the result of this study is important for learning and teaching.

Accounts of code-switching no longer consider code switching as a compensation for linguistic deficiency among bilingual speakers (Adendorff, 1996). On the contrary, code-switching is regarded as a linguistic behavior motivated by functional considerations (Adendorff,

1996). The literature shows that code switching is an integral part of most language classrooms (Jacobson, 2004). What is striking is that little systematic research has been carried out on factors that lead language teachers to switch codes in the Iranian EFL context. The importance of the present study is that it will make an attempt to identify potential effects of code switching on learners' learning of grammar in the EFL context in Iran.

Theoretical background

Gumperz (1982) coined the term code switching to refer to marked verbal or non-verbal choices of forms in a communicative encounter. Numan and Carter (2001) defined the term as switching from one language to another in the same discourse. Although code-switching has received considerable debate in the literature, the issue of linguistic code switching in foreign language classrooms has not been extensively studied. Zabrodska (2007) holds that code-switching has been largely addressed in the literature in terms of language transfer or a compensatory communicative strategy. However, code-switching can be considered as an integral part of language learning and needs to be studied as such.

Switching languages in a conversation may provide an opportunity for mutual understanding. Skiba (1997) argues that linguistic development is realized through samples of language which are appropriate and code switching may show the need for provision of appropriate samples. In the second language classroom, code-switching may be incorporated into the communication activities designed for the teaching of a second language. Ife (2007) argues that code switching is especially valuable in the early stages of adult language learning, although Ife notifies that this does not mean that L2 input should not be maximally provided in the classroom, but an argument in favor of L1 use as an additional resource in second language learning. Proficiency movement has led to a shift away from the focus on accurate form toward a focus on fluency and communicative effectiveness, a shift which can be used in favor of the use of code switching in the classroom.

Code-switching has mostly been studied in individual case studies including a study by Platt and Platt (1975) who addressed the multilingual situation in Singapore and another study conducted by Blom and Gumperz (1972) who focused on code switching patterns in parts of Norway. Linguistic aspects of code-switching have been addressed by Woolford (1983), Di Sciullo, Muysken and Singh (1986), and Poplack (1980) who used natural discourse, but few studies have examined code-switching in the context of classroom interaction. This may be rooted in the fact that code switching in the classroom was long viewed negatively and was largely prevented because using the target language was to be maximized.

Merritt et al. (1992) studied the motivations behind teacher code-switching between English, Swahili and mother-tongue in three Kenyan primary schools and reported a variety of reasons for code-switching including the socializing role of the teacher, the importance of variation and repetition, the teacher's linguistic competence, and insecurity. In the literature, code-switching is found to be used in the second language classroom for five major reasons:

- ❖ Linguistic insecurity, e.g. the difficulty teachers experience in teaching new concepts (Merritt et al., 1992).
- ❖ Topic switch especially in grammar instruction which is preferably in the mother tongue of the students (Flyman, 1997).
- ❖ Affective functions and spontaneous expression of emotions (Flyman-Mattsson & Burenhult-Mattsson, 1999).
- ❖ Socializing by using the students' first language to signal friendship and solidarity (Merritt et al., 1992).
- ❖ Repeating and conveying the same message in both languages for clarity.

Most of the previous research on code switching deals with natural discourse, not with classroom interaction and this is while we might expect classroom code-switching to differ in several important respects from code-switching in natural discourse. Speaking activities in classroom especially communicative activities help learners transfer learned language to acquired store. Communicative activities can act as a trigger for the students to think how best to express the meaning they wish to convey. This is why research is needed to pinpoint different aspects of code-switching in language classrooms.

Conversational functions of code-switching

One of the motivations behind switching codes is for establishing resemblances between interlocutors because people have a tendency to like those who have a similarity to their styles of speaking and modes of expressing themselves (Clair & Giles, 1980). As a language speaker becomes more like another speaker, the probability that the latter will like the former increases (Koslow, Shamdasani, & Touchstone, 1994).

Studies have reported that code switching is a communicative device depending on the switcher's communicative intents (Adendorff, 1996). Speakers may utilize code switching in order to organize, enhance and enrich their speech to achieve their communicative goals. For example, speakers may use code switching to express solidarity with a particular group (Milroy, 1987). What is more, speakers may utilize code switching to fill a conceptual gap (Gysel, 1992). In general, code switching is believed to be a communication strategy providing continuity in speech to compensate for the inability to express certain concepts.

Studies have also shown that code switching may be used in order to reiterate or emphasize a point (Gal, 1979). By repeating the same point in another language, the speaker is stressing it in the discussion. Moreover, switching to the mother tongue takes place for different pragmatic reasons ranging from mitigating and aggravating messages (Koziol, 2000) to effective production (Azhar & Bahiyah, 1994) to distancing strategy (David, 1999).

Socio-Cultural Models of Code Switching

Code switching literature may be divided into several streams. However, two broad areas include Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (1998) which is a social psychological approach and studies of the effect of code switching on talk in interaction. In the following section, each of these models will be briefly introduced.

Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model

According to the Markedness Model proposed by Myers-Scotton (1998), each language in a multilingual community is associated with particular social roles. By speaking a particular language, an interlocutor signals his/her understanding of the current situation and his/her role within the context. By using more than one language, speakers may initiate negotiation over relevant social roles. Myers-Scotton assumes that speakers must share an understanding of the social meanings of each available code. If no such norms existed, interlocutors would have no basis for understanding the significance of particular code choices.

The Markedness Model is stated in the form of a principle and three maxims. The negotiation principle, which is based on Grice's (1975) cooperative principle, constitutes the model's central assumption. Three maxims of the model include the unmarked choice maxim, the marked choice maxim, and the exploratory choice maxim. Thus, the social meanings of code choice and the causes of code switching are based on interlocutors' rights and obligations. Critics of the Markedness Model argue that it relies too heavily on external knowledge, including assumptions about what speakers understand and believe (Auer, 1998). Although the Markedness Model is the most influential model of code switching motivations, Auer (1995) notes that

research has failed to reveal a strong correlations between particular languages and speech activities that the markedness model predicts.

Interaction and code switching

The Interaction Model (Auer, 1984) is largely based on conversation analysis, and views code switching as a way of organizing conversational exchange and as a way to obtain knowledge of the wider context where the conversation occurs. Research in this regard has attempted to describe the role of code switching in the language of turn and sequence and the ways that language alternations make broader contextual knowledge relevant to an ongoing discourse. On this view, code switching is without social meaning because it is a necessary consequence of certain situational parameters (Auer, 1984). Auer maintains that situation is created by the talk in interaction, suggesting that code switching does not derive from the meanings of the available languages, but rather is the outcome of the sequential development of the conversation (Auer, 1984).

Along these lines, conversation research has suggested that the function of code switching is to enhance turn selection (Cromdal, 2001), to soften refusals (Bani-Shoraka, 2005) to accomplish repair (Auer, 1995), or mark dispreferred responses (Li Wei, 1998). Stroud (1998) criticizes approaches to code switching based strictly on conversation analysis, suggesting that conversation analysis cannot provide satisfactory analysis of language behavior in non-Western contexts.

Research on code-switching

Code-switching can be defined as language use that consists of material from two or more language varieties at any level from the discourse to the clause (Jake and Myers-Scotton, 2009). In recent decades, bilingual codeswitching studies have been done in different parts of the world, including America, Europe, Africa, Asia and the Middle East (Chan, 2009). It has been widely discussed from the perspective of general linguistics, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics. From the sociolinguistic perspective, theories and models have been built to explain conversational choices, such as Gumperz's (1982) notion of contextualization cues, Myers-Scotton's (1983) Markedness Model.

The long-standing problem is the diversity and variation of code-switching patterns which appear to make it hard for any economical and universal syntactic account (Chan, 2009). Speakers familiar with more than one language often alternate languages between or even within sentences, particularly in the company of other bilinguals (Scotton & Ury, 1977). It is now widely accepted that such codeswitching incurs cognitive costs, such as a slowdown in comprehension or production when stimuli involve mixed languages, particularly when the input language changes unpredictably (Thomas & Allport, 2000).

In the last two decades, code switching has attracted considerable attention. In this section, a few studies on code switching are briefly reviewed. Moodley (2007) examined the use of code switching by English language learners in multilingual classrooms to achieve specific learning outcomes. Myers-Scotton (1998) studied code switching, showing that this strategy is used by learners to show friendliness or to protect the listener's self-image. A number of researchers (e.g., Burden, 2001) have argued that code switching can be useful in the process of English language teaching and learning. Other researchers (e.g., Skiba, 1997) consider code switching as an opportunity for language development because it allows the effective transfer of information from the senders to the receivers. Tien and Liu (2006) found that low proficiency students considered code-switching in their EFL classes as a helpful technique in comprehension.

In the Iranian EFL context, Simin, Teimouri, Kasmaee, and Rezaei (2005) studied the role of code-switching in material learning in a classroom context and also students' attitudes towards this linguistic phenomenon. For this purpose, the students' notes, which were taken from

the teachers' speech, were studied and then their written notes were analyzed qualitatively with a focus on code-switching. Then, the questionnaire was distributed among participants to investigate their attitudes. According to the quantitative and qualitative data obtained from the questionnaire distributed among 60 participants and the interview, code switching was very helpful in learning assisting the learners to remember better for their exams.

A study by Hancock (1997) conducted in an ESL class in Madrid and another study by Mori (2004) carried out in a Japanese class in America revealed the patterns of students' use of code switching in foreign language classrooms. Hancock (1997) concluded that the dichotomy between bad L1 use and good L2 use in a language classroom should be dismissed because code switching is a natural by-product of bilingualism. Based on her study, Mori (2004) suggested that the prevalent target-language use policy in language classrooms should be reconsidered and that code switching should be considered as a useful teaching and learning strategy.

Code-switching (CS) that has received the attention of many linguists and researchers over the last century. Code-switching means using various languages in a single discourse. But from a more professional perspective code-switching can be defined in different ways. Muysken (1995), for example, defines CS as "the alternative use by bilinguals of two or more languages in the same conversation" (p. 7). Gumperz (1982, p.59) defines code-switching in these words: "The juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or sub-systems". The definition given by Bentahila et al. (1983:302) was: "the use of two languages within a single conversation, exchange or utterance".

Clyne (1987) defined the term as the alternative use of two languages either within a sentence or between sentences. Different concepts have been suggested for this linguistic behavior. Agheyisi (1977), for example calls it language interlarding while Scotton and Ury (1977) term it code switching. Code mixing is the name preferred by Bokamba (1988) and Haugen (1953) label it integration. However, code switching is, no doubt, the most favored term in recent sociolinguistic study (Wardhaugh, 2010).

Badrul Hisham and Kamaruzaman (2009) found a contact between teachers' code-switching and learners' learning success when they were considering learners' perceptions of the teachers' code switching in English language classrooms. Their investigation showed that learners perceived code switching as a positive tool due to the several functions it has and that there were important relationships between teachers' code-switching and learners' affective support and learners' learning success.

In a study, Jamshidi and Navehebrahim (2013) investigated the utility of using L1 in EFL classrooms, where English was a foreign language. Subjects were beginning, advanced and intermediate students. Their native language was Persian. A questionnaire was given to the subjects to investigate the effectiveness of using their mother tongue. The results showed that using L1 by teachers or students increased the effects of input which was given. The results showed that subjects who used Persian had more opportunities to improve their skills.

Some researchers have supported the use of code-switching. Heredia and Brown (2005, p. 214) stated that people use code-switching to understand better. Several scholars, however, do not agree with the use of code switching in classrooms. Simon (2001, p. 318) claims that using code-switching in classrooms has been forbidden for a long time. At the end of the 19th century using native language in foreign language classrooms was prohibited. The goal was to put the subjects in a target language environment to help them to speak more in the target language.

Novianti (2003) conducted a study on most frequent types of code switching (inter-sentential, intra-sentential and tag switching in Twitter and why respondent used code-switching

in their communication. The results showed that intra-sentential switching was the most frequent one and because of real lexical need they use code-switching.

Rahimi and Jafari (2011) investigated the types and functions of code switching and gender preferences at an intermediate English Proficiency level in EFL classrooms. 50 hours of four class performances were observed and audio-recorded. The results of the study suggested that teachers applied code-switching more frequently when they tried to give Persian equivalents of English words and expressions. The use of inter-sentential code-switching was more common. Code-switching was more frequent while students did the assigned tasks. Male students switched when they produced humorous utterances while their female classmates switched more frequently when they wanted to give L1 equivalents. Filling in the attitude questionnaire, most of students believed that students and teachers should not apply Persian so much even though it facilitated their interactions.

Ajmal Gulzar, Farooq, and Muhammad Umer (2013) investigated inter-sentential patterns of code-switching. It was a gender based investigation on EFL teachers. Researchers sought to investigate which group of teachers male or female used more inter-sentential switching in their discussion. They recorded some sessions in university classrooms. It was found that all the male and female teachers switched code facing shortages in terms of both linguistic resources and verbal genres.

To compare intra-sentential switching and inter-sentential switching Kebeya (2013) investigated Inter- and Intra-Sentential Switching. In this study the aim was to compare 3 types of Kenyas local languages Luo/Luyia and Luo /Gusii to see possible code-switching patterns. They found that both intra and inter-sentential switching were present in contacts of those two languages. Some issues affecting intra-sentential switching unlike the others affected inter-sentential switching. So they concluded that it is not possible to compare inter and intra-sentential switching.

Momenian and Ghafar Samar (2011) conducted a study into the functions of code-switching. They worked on advance and elementary teachers and students' functions and patterns of code-switching in Iranian English classroom. In this study they used their L1 in classroom which was against the principles of traditional teaching. 60 students and 30 teachers were selected to answer two sets of questionnaire; one for student the other for students. They had to fill it out based on what they remembered from their classes. Results showed that elementary teachers and students made higher use of code-switching than the advanced group.

Method

This study aims at examining the effect of the ways in which EFL teachers switch codes on EFL learners' learning of grammar. Although the issue has been investigated in various domains with different groups of learners, the paucity of research on the determining the effect of the ways in which EFL teachers switch codes on EFL learners' learning of grammar is evident. This chapter describes the participants, the instruments used, data collection procedure, and the procedure used to analyze the data.

Participants

In order to gather the required data, four groups of participant were selected who enrolled in two different institutions in Qazvin for conversation courses in order to be prepared for foreign language speaking. The total number of learners were 60, 15 learners in each class. Participants were both male and female, whose first language was Farsi. The age range was between 15-20. All of participants were at the pre-intermediate level. Participants were selected randomly and were homogeneous based on the criteria of the two language centers.

Procedure

The learners took an English course lasting for 8 sessions, each session lasting one and a half hours. All four groups had the same teacher and the same materials to learn, and the selected grammatical points were new for the four groups. To make sure that the teaching material was new for everybody, a test of grammar was given before teaching. The grammatical points were taught differently in each class. In the first class, grammatical points were taught using intra-sentential code-switching; the second class was taught using inter-sentential switching and the third one using tag-switching. The last class was the control group who were taught the grammatical points without code-switching. In the last session after teaching grammar to the classes, a post-test was given to the students to determine the effect of different kinds of teaching grammar on students' learning.

As it was mentioned in the first chapter, inter-sentential switching is defined as changes between two languages, where a sentence in the first language has been completed and the next sentence starts with a different language (e.g. Appel & Muysken 1987, p.118), while intra-sentential switching, according to Kaswan (2010:30) is a switch from one language inside a sentence. Finally, tag-switching: putting a tag in one language to a sentence in another language (Romaine 1995: 122). The teachers in the three experimental classes taught the grammatical points using inter-sentential switching, intra-sentential switching, and tag switching. However, the teacher teaching the control group used no code-switching. That is, English was the only language spoken in the classroom during the eight sessions.

Four grammatical points were selected for the treatment in the three classes: 1) Simple present tense, 2) How much / How many, 3) Present continuous (affirmative and negative statements), and Frequency adverbs (always, usually, sometimes, never). In the following section, examples are presented of how the teachers used intra-sentential code-switching, inter-sentential code-switching, and tag code-switching.

➤ Examples of inter-sentential code-switching:

- ❖ The servant cleans our rooms (خدمتکار هر روز تمیز می کند و می شوید) and washes the dishes every day.
- ❖ Every time she goes to the store (هر بار که به فروشگاه می رود می خرد), she buys many things.
- ❖ My brother usually learns his lesson very quickly (برادرم معمولاً یاد می گیرد) whenever I teach him.
- ❖ The steam sings (بخار آواز می خواند وقتی بیرون می آید) when it comes out of the kettle.
- ❖ She wants to wash the dishes (می خواهد ظرفها را بشورد قبل از اینکه بخوابد) before she goes to bed.

➤ Examples of intra-sentential code-switching

- ❖ In summer there are (برگهای زیادی روی درختان است) many leaves on the trees.
- ❖ There are (زنان زیادی وجود دارند) a lot of women in the room.
- ❖ How many (چند نفر را) people did you see in the park?
- ❖ How many (چند عدد گل وجود دارد) flowers are there in the garden?
- ❖ There are (چند نفر پسر) some boys in the park.

➤ Examples of tag code-switching

- ❖ One of the girls is taking pictures of the dolphins (در حال عکس گرفتن).
- ❖ He is playing the guitar now. (در حال نواختن).
- ❖ I am hearing the voice now (دارم می شنوم).

- ❖ They are playing in the yard (در حال بازی کردن)
- ❖ Mahmood is looking for his pencil at the present moment. (دارد دنبال مداد می گردد)

Instruments

The following instruments were used in this study:

- Teaching materials used as treatment like the examples presented above.
- Two different tests were designed for the pre-test and the post-test. Each of these two tests had 28 questions, 7 questions for each grammatical point.
- There was also a pretest to ensure the homogeneity of the participants. The participants were administered a PET (Preliminary English Test) test before starting the new semester at their institutes. PET is a standard test for determining the proficiency of intermediate level students. This test contained 55 multiple-choice items, 30 items tested the grammatical knowledge, and 25 items examined the vocabulary knowledge of the learners. The test also contained four reading comprehension exercises including matching, true-false, comprehension questions and a text with gaps. A sample of the test is given in Appendix A.
- An attitudes questionnaire was used in order to see the students' attitudes towards the teachers' code-switching. The purpose of the questionnaire was to examine the participants' attitudes towards teachers' code-switching in classroom and the students' code-switching preferences. The questionnaire asked questions which were related to the students' attitudes towards code-switching in different classroom situations. The questions were of the multiple-choice type allowing the students to choose one answer from among the three answers provided. It took the students approximately five minutes to fill out the questionnaire.

Results

Investigation of the first research question

In order to answer the first research question of this study, which sought to answer whether there is any significant difference between the effects of intra-sentential switching on EFL learners' learning of grammatical points, a T-Test was utilized and the results are summarized in Table 4.1.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of the students' grammar scores in intra-sentential switching group

Dependent variable:
scores

Group	Mean	Std. Error Deviation	Std. Error Mean	N
Experimental	18.66	1.09	0.36	15
Control	15.26	1.49	0.28	15
Total				30

As Table 1 shows, there is a statistical difference between the mean scores and standard deviations of the students in the intra-sentential switching method and the class in which no code-switching occurred.

According to these results, the experimental method group who received the intra-sentential switching instruction got higher mean scores and lower standard deviation than the students who were taught using no code-switching. It means that the students in intra-sentential switching method group, with the mean of 18.66 and standard deviation of the 1.09, had better performance than those in the other class, with the mean of 15.26 and standard deviation of 1.49.

The following results of T-test indicate whether the observed mean differences are statistically significant or not. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Results of Independent Samples Test in intra-sentential switching group

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Teaching grammar	Equal variances assumed	1.43	0.24	7.40	28	0.00	3.40	0.45	2.45	4.34
	Equal variances not assumed			7.40	26.5	0.00	3.40	0.45	2.45	4.34

As it is seen in Table 2, the significant value of teaching grammar scores is 0.00 (0.00<0.05). It means that there is statistically significant difference between the scores of the students in the control and experimental group. That is, the students in the experimental group had significant performance than those in the control group.

Based on the above statements, the first null hypothesis of this study suggested there is no significant difference between the effects of intra-sentential switching on EFL learners grammar learning is rejected.

Investigation of the second research question

The second research question aimed to investigate if there is any significant difference between the effects of inter-sentential switching on EFL learners grammar learning and those of using no code-switching. To this end, a T-test was utilized for analyzing the data. Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics.

Table 3 Descriptive statistics of the students' scores in inter-sentential switching group

Dependent variable:
scores

Group	Mean	Std. Error Deviation	Std. Error Mean	N
Experimental	17.60	1.45	0.37	15
Control	15.26	1.49	0.28	15
Total				30

The results of the above table indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between the performance of the students in experimental and control group. That is, the students who were instructed through inter-sentential switching method had outperformed those who did not receive this instruction.

Table 4 Results of Independent Samples Test in inter-sentential switching group

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means								
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Teaching grammar	Equal variances assumed	1.53	0.226	4.95	28	0.00	2.333	0.47	1.36	3.29
	Equal variances not assumed			4.95	26.08	0.00	2.333	0.47	1.36	3.30

Based on the results presented in Table 4, the F-value is statically significant ($F=1.53, p < 0.05$). That is, the students in inter-sentential switching method had a significantly better performance than those in the no-code switching class. Therefore, the second null hypothesis of this study suggested there is no significant difference between the effects of inter-sentential switching and those of no code-switching on EFL learners' grammar learning is rejected.

Investigation of the third research question

The third research question sought to investigate whether there is any significant difference between the effects of tag-sentential switching and those of no code-switching on EFL learners' grammar learning. To answer this question, another T-Test was used and the results are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5 Descriptive statistics of the students' scores in tag-sentential switching group

Dependent variable:
scores

Group	Mean	Std. Error Deviation	Std. Error Mean	N
Experimental	16.66	1.09	0.30	15
Control	15.26	1.49	0.28	15
Total				30

According to the results of the above table, the students in tag-sentential switching method had statistically outperformed the students in the group which received instruction using no code-switching. In other words, the students in tag-sentential switching method had higher mean score (M=16.66) and lower standard deviation (SD=1.09) than the students in traditional method group (M=15.26, SD=1.49).

Table 6 Results of Independent Samples Test in tag-sentential switching group

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means								
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Teaching grammar	Equal variances assumed	0.15	0.700	3.36	28	0.00	1.400	0.41	0.54	2.25
	Equal variances not assumed			3.36	27.87	0.00	1.400	0.41	0.548	2.25

The results of Table 6 indicate that the mean difference between these two groups, i.e. tag-sentential switching and no code-switching group is significant (F=0.15, p < 0.05). Therefore, the third null hypothesis of this study was rejected. It can be concluded that tag-sentential switching method had significant effects on EFL learner's grammar learning.

Investigation of the fourth research question

In order to answer the fourth research question of this study, which was the investigation of the effects of code-switching on EFL learners' grammar learning, the one-way ANOVA procedure was used and the results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7 Descriptive statistics of code switching

N	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Min.	Max.
---	------	------------	----------------------------------	------	------

			Std. Deviation		Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Intra-switching method	15	18.6667	1.39728	.36078	17.8929	19.4405	16.00	20.00
Inter-switching method	15	17.6000	1.45406	.37544	16.7948	18.4052	15.00	20.00
Tag-switching method	15	16.6667	1.17514	.30342	16.0159	17.3174	15.00	18.00
No code-switching	15	15.2667	1.49978	.28396	14.6576	15.8757	14.00	17.00
Total	60	17.0500	1.77959	.22974	16.5903	17.5097	14.00	20.00

As it is seen in the above table, the students' grammar scores in intra-sentential switching method has the highest mean (18.66) and lowest standard deviation (1.39) followed closely by the inter-sentential switching method (M=17.60, SD=1.45) and tag-sentential switching method (M=16.66, SD=1.17). The no code-switching group has the lowest mean (M=15.26) and the highest standard deviation (1.49).

The following results of one-way ANOVA indicate whether the observed mean differences are statistically significant or not. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8 Results of one-way ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	93.65	3	31.21	18.75	0.000
Within Groups	93.20	56	1.66		
Total	186.85	59			

As it is seen in this table, the observed F value and the significance level (F= 18.75, P < 0.05) reveal that code switching had statistically significant effect on EFL learners' grammar teaching and learning. Therefore, the null hypotheses of this study suggested code-switching does not have any significant effect on EFL learners' grammar learning was rejected.

To locate the differences between the means, the post-Hoc Scheffé test was utilized. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9 Post-Hoc Multiple Comparisons of means for code-switching

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Intra-switching	Inter-switching	2.00000*	.47107	.000	.7527	3.2473
	Tag-switching	1.06667	.47107	.119	-.1807	2.3140
	No code-switching	3.40000*	.47107	.000	2.1527	4.6473
Inter-switching	Intra-switching	-2.00000*	.47107	.000	-3.2473	-.7527
	Tag-switching	-.93333	.47107	.207	-2.1807	.3140
	No code-switching	1.40000*	.47107	.022	.1527	2.6473
Tag-switching	Inter-switching	.93333	.47107	.207	-.3140	2.1807
	Intra-switching	-1.06667	.47107	.119	-2.3140	.1807

	No code-switching	2.33333*	.47107	.000	1.0860	3.5807
No code-switching	Inter-switching	-1.40000*	.47107	.022	-2.6473	-.1527
	Intra-switching	-3.40000*	.47107	.000	-4.6473	-2.1527
	Tag-switching	-2.33333*	.47107	.000	-3.5807	-1.0860

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As it is obvious in the table above, the difference between the intra-sentential switching method group and the inter-sentential switching method group is statistically significant, indicating that the intra-sentential switching method group performed better than the inter-sentential switching method group. Moreover, the mean differences between the intra-sentential switching method group and the other two groups, i.e. tag-sentential switching method group and no code-switching group are statistically significant, suggesting that the participants of intra-sentential switching method group have outperformed their counterparts in the other two groups.

In addition, the difference between the inter-sentential switching method group and the tag-sentential switching method group is statistically insignificant, suggesting that the performances of the students in both groups were to some extent the same. That is, although the inter-sentential switching method group performed better than the tag-sentential switching method group, there is only a trend towards a meaningful difference. In other words, the participants' performances in these two groups were more or less similar.

The fifth research question: Attitudes towards code-switching

In the next step, the study aimed to examine the learners' attitudes towards code-switching. The purpose of the questionnaire was to examine the participants' attitudes towards teachers' code-switching in classroom and the students' code-switching preferences. The questionnaire asked questions which were related to the students' attitudes towards code-switching in different classroom situations. The questions were of the multiple-choice type allowing the students to choose one answer from among the three answers provided. It took the students approximately five minutes to fill out the questionnaire.

Table 10.

Attitudes towards code-switching

Items	Answers		
	Farsi	English	A combination of both
When my teacher explains grammatical points, I want him or her to use.....	73%	5%	22%
When my teacher gives us instructions, I want him or her to use.....	64%	17%	19%
When my teacher informs us about a test, I want him or her to use.....	66%	13%	21%
When my teacher gives me my result on a test, I want him or her to use.....	82%	7%	11%
When my teacher and I talk about my grade, I want him or her to use.....	77%	6%	17%
When my teacher speaksduring an English conversation, I understand better	10%	59%	31%
When I ask a question in Farsi concerning grammar, I like my teacher to answer in....	32%	25%	43%

When I ask a question in Farsi concerning vocabulary, I like my teacher to answer in.....	25%	51%	24%
When I ask a question in Farsi concerning reading passages, I like my teacher to answer in	22%	48%	30%
When I don't understand a point my teacher explains in English, I like him/her to repeat it in.....	78%	9%	13%
I like my teacher to allow me to speak in.....in class.	23%	69%	18%

As can be seen in Table 10, a majority of the students (73%) preferred Farsi when learning grammar. English was in fact the least preferred language alternative (5%) whilst 22% of the students preferred a combination of Farsi and English. In giving instructions, 64% of the participants preferred Farsi, 17% preferred English and 19% preferred a combination of both Farsi and English. It is interesting that the majority of students liked the teacher not to allow them to speak Farsi in class. That is, 69% of the students liked the teacher to allow English as the only language of the classroom, while 23% of them preferred Farsi. This shows that students have understood their different needs in class and prefer the teacher to use Farsi or a combination of Farsi and English when they think it is necessary for understanding grammar, and not during conversations.

Discussion

The present study attempted to investigate whether there is a significant difference between the effects of intra-sentential, inter-sentential and tag-sentential switching on EFL learners' grammar learning and teaching. The results of the study revealed that the mean differences of students' grammar scores among these groups are statistically significant.

Based on this finding, the intra-sentential switching group has the highest mean (18.66) among all groups. The inter-sentential switching group has the second highest mean (17.60) that followed by the tag-sentential switching group (16.66).

The obtained results also indicate that the mean difference between the inter-sentential switching and tag-sentential switching group is not statistically significant. The implication is that the students' grammar scores in both groups were similar although the students' scores in inter-sentential switching group were a bit higher than those in tag-sentential switching group. Based on these statements, the null hypotheses of this study suggesting different kinds of code-switching do not have significant effect on EFL learners' grammar teaching and learning were rejected. The results of the study are in accordance with a number of previous studies (Badrul Hisham & Kamaruzaman, 2009; Burden, 2001; Simin, Teimouri, Kasmae & Rezaei, 2005; Skiba, 1997) who argued for the effectiveness of different types of code-switching on EFL learners' grammar learning. The findings of the present study also are in line with the results of Novianti (2003) who believed that intra-sentential switching is the most frequent type of code-switching.

The results of this study are not in line with those of Simon and Thomas (2001) who claimed that using code-switching in classrooms do not have any effect on students' learning due to the fact that applying code-switching in the classroom forbidden learners to speak more in the target language. In turn, this study confirmed the results of Heredia and Brown (2005) who stated code switching is a helpful tool for learners to comprehend the materials better. The results of this study were not similar to those of Kebeya (2013) who stated that there is no difference between the effects of inter and intra-sentential switching because the results of the present study revealed that the students in intra-sentential group outperformed those in inter-sentential switching one.

According to Gal (1979), code switching is used to emphasize a point in teaching a language. In fact, by repeating the same point in another language, the speaker is stressing it in the discussion. In this regard, code switching can be considered as a communicative device

depending on the switcher's communicative intents because speakers may utilize it to achieve their communicative goals (Adendorff, 1996).

It can be concluded that code switching can provide an opportunity for language development because it allows the effective transfer of information from the senders to the receivers. Therefore, it is a communication strategy which provides continuity in speech to compensate for the inability to express certain concepts.

Summary of the findings

Addressing the research question of this study, the following null hypotheses were tested: Different types of code-switching have no significant effects on EFL learners' grammar teaching and learning.

Based on the obtained results, the mean difference of the students' grammar scores in intra-sentential switching group in comparison to those of inter-sentential switching and tag-sentential switching group was so significant (intra-sentential switching: $M = 18.66$ and $SD. = 1.39$, inter-sentential switching: $M = 17.60$ and $SD. = 1.45$, tag-sentential switching: $M = 16.66$ and $SD. = 1.17$). That is to say, the students' grammar scores in intra-sentential switching group had the highest mean score, the second one was inter-sentential switching group and the third one was tag-sentential switching group.

In addition, the observed F value and the significance level ($F = 11.180$, $P < 0.05$) ($F = 11.180$, $P < 0.05$) indicated that intra-sentential switching, inter-sentential switching, and tag-sentential switching had statistically significant effect on EFL learners' grammar teaching and learning.

Therefore, the null hypotheses of this study suggesting that intra-sentential switching, inter-sentential switching, and tag-sentential switching were not significantly different from no code-switching in teaching grammar were rejected.

Pedagogical implications

This study, like other studies, has some implications for different individuals including EFL learners, EFL teachers as well as syllabus designers and researchers.

Learning foreign language, especially learning grammar of a language, is a complex process because learners should integrate prior knowledge to the new learnt ones. In this regard, the learning process can be facilitated if teachers try different types of code-switching. Moreover, teachers should also familiarize students with the advantages, applications and procedures of different types of code-switching in order to enhance their grammar knowledge. To this end, they can utilize useful examples to indicate the procedures of the respective techniques more explicitly and fan the flame of the enthusiasm for it.

References

- Adendorff, R. (1996). The functions of code-switching among high school teachers and students in KwaZulu and implications for teacher education. In K. Biley & D. Nunan (eds.). *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education*. pp. 388-406. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Agheyisi, R. N. (1977). Language Interlarding in the Speech of Nigerians. In P. Kotey and H. Der-Houssikian (eds.). *Language and Linguistic Problems in Africa*. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press, 99-110.

- Al-Hejin, B. (Undated) Attention and Awareness: Evidence from Cognitive and Second Language Acquisition Research. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, Vol. 4, No. 1* Teachers College, Columbia University
- Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language Contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of Teacher Response to Student Writing in a Multiple-Draft Composition Classroom: Is Content Feedback Followed by Form Feedback the Best Method? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9* (3), 227 – 257.
- Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In: Milroy, L. and Muysken, P. (eds.) *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code switching*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Azhar, M. S. & Bahiyah, A. H. (1994). English in Malaysia: The case of two myths. *Proceedings of International English Language Education Conference*. pp. 129-144. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Badrul Hisham, A & Kamaruzaman, J. (2009). Teachers' Code-Switching in Classroom Instructions for Low English Proficient Learners. *English Language Teaching Journal, Vol. 2, No. 2, June 2009 p.46*. Retrieved from www.ccsenet.org
- Bani-Shoraka, H. (2003). A revitalization of the Azerbaijani language and identity? *Orientalia Suecana 51*, 17-24.
- Bentahila, A., and Davies, Eileen D. (1983). The syntax of Arabic-French code-switching. *Lingua 59: 301-30*.
- Bokamba, E. (1988). Code Mixing, Language Variation and Linguistic Theory: Evidence from Bantu languages. *Lingua, 76, 21-62*.
- Brooks, F. B. & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative vases. *Hispania, 77, 262-274*.
- Burden, P. (2001). When do native English speakers and Japanese college students disagree about the use of Japanese in the English conversation classroom? *The Language Teacher, April 2001*. Retrieved from: <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/2001/04/burden>
- Burgess, J., and Etherington, S. (2002) Focus on grammatical form: explicit or implicit? *System 30 433–458*
- Clair, S., Robert N. & Giles, H. (1980). *The Social and psychological contexts of language*. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Li, W. (2000). Dimensions of bilingualism. In Li (Ed). *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 2-21). London: Routledge.
- Libben, G. (2000). Representation and processing in the second language lexicon: the homogeneity hypothesis. In J. Archibald (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory* (pp. 228-248). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lightbown, P. (1998). *The importance of timing in focus on form*. In: Doughty, C., Williams, J. (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 177–196.
- Long, M., Robinson, P., (1998). *Focus on Form: Theory, research and practice*. In: Doughty, C., Williams, J. (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 15–41.
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target Language, Collaborative Learning and Autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mangubhai, F. (2001) Book floods and comprehensible input floods: providing ideal conditions for second language acquisition *International Journal of Educational Research 35, 147–156*
- Merritt, M., A. Cleghorn, J. O. Abagi & G. Bunyi. (1992). Socializing multilingualism: determinants of codeswitching in Kenyan primary classrooms'. In C. M. Eastman (ed.), *Codeswitching*, 103-21. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Meskill, C. and Anthony, N. (2005). Foreign language learning with CMC: forms of online instructional discourse in a hybrid Russian class. *System, 33, 89–105*.
- Milroy, L & Muysken, P. (ed.) (1995). *One speaker, two languages: cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Milroy, L. (1987). *Observing and analysing natural language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Momenian, M & Ghafar Samar, R. (2011). Functions of code-switching among Iranian advanced and elementary teachers and students. Vol. 6(13), pp. 769-777. Iran:Tehran, Tarbiat Modares University
- Moodley, V. (2007). Code switching in the multilingual English first language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 707-722.
- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88, 536-5500.
- Myers-Scotton, C., (2006). *Multiple voices: an introduction to Bilingualism*, Blackwell publishing.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1988). Self-enhancing code switching as interactional power. *Language and Communication*, 8(3): 199 – 211.
- Naseh, L. (1997). Codeswitching between Persian and Swedish, Eurosla 7 Proceedings: 201-211
- Muysken (2000:1) refers to codswitching as “the rapid succession of several languages in a single speech event”
- Nassaji H. (2000) *Towards Integrating Form-Focused Instruction and Communicative Interaction in the Second Language Classroom: Some Pedagogical Possibilities* The Modern Language Journal, 84, 2, 241-250
- Novianti, W. (2003). The Use of Code Switching in Twitter. (A Case Study in English Education Department) 2. 1-10
- Numan, D. & Carter, D. (2001). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: CUP.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Park, E. S. (Undated) *Constraints of Implicit Focus on Form: Insights from a Study of Input Enhancement* Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, Vol. 4, No. 2 Teachers College, Columbia University
- Platt, J. & Platt, H. (1975). *The social significance of speech: An introduction and workbook in sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, Inc.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y la termino en español. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.
- Radwan, A. A. (2005) The effectiveness of explicit attention to form in language learning *System* 33 69–87.
- Rahimi, A., & Jafari, Z. (2011). Iranian students' attitudes towards the facilitative and debilitating role of code-switching; types and moments of code-switching at EFL classroom. *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics*, Vol 4. 15-28.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schweers, W. Jr. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 37(2), 6-9.
- Scotton, C.M., & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: The Social functions of code switching *Linguistics*, 193, 5-20.
- Simin, S., Teimouri, F., Kasmaee, H., & Rezaei, S. (2005). The role and the effects of code-switching in material learning. The first national conference on research in teaching English, translation, and linguistics.
- Simon, L. (2001). Towards a new understanding of code-switching in the foreign language classroom. In: R. Jacobson, ed. 2000. *Trends in Linguistics: Code-switching Worldwide II*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 10(8). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-CodeSwitching.html>
- Spada, N., (1997), *Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Acquisition: A Review of Classroom and Laboratory Research* Language Teaching, 30, 73-87
- Stockwell, P. (2002). *Sociolinguistics: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Stroud, C. (1998). Perspectives on cultural variability of discourse and some implications for code-switching.” In Peter Auer (ed.): *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*, 321-348. London: Routledge.
- Thomas, S, G., (2001). *Language contact, an introduction*. [e-book] Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd. Available through: <http://books.google.com/>. [Accessed 10 December].
- Tien, C and Liu, K. (2006). Code-switching in two EFL classes in Taiwan. In Azirah Hashim & Norizah

- Hassan. (Eds). English in Southeast Asia: prospects, perspectives and possibilities. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya Press.
- Timm, Lenora A. (1975). Spanish-English code-switching. El porqué y how-not-to. Romance Philology 28. 33-45.
- Wardaugh, R. (1998). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 3rd Edition.