



## Code-switching as a linguistic resource in an EFL context at a language center in Mexico

Tatiana Estefanía Galván de la Fuente<sup>✉1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Ensenada, Baja California, Mexico

<sup>✉</sup>E-mail: [tatiana@uabc.edu.mx](mailto:tatiana@uabc.edu.mx)

### ABSTRACT

This study explores code-switching (CS) as an interactional resource by learners in an EFL classroom in a predominantly monolingual context of Mexico could provide university students with a useful resource in language learning. The research aim is to identify and analyze the codeswitching interactional patterns that the students use to participate in the classroom such as reiteration, equivalence, floor-holding and socializing. In order to analyze these ways, observation sessions were carried out as these depictions demonstrated what was taking place in the EFL classroom. Field notes are used to triangulate data; therefore, a more in-depth and rich analysis is brought forth as to how these resources are used. Accordingly, classroom data is analyzed using an applied Conversation Analysis approach. This case study is part of a PhD project that explores the linguistic practices of nine students from two intermediate EFL classes. Both observations and field notes reveal that learners' draw on CS for carrying out learning activities, negotiate meaning, as it is a supporting element in the communication of information and in the learners' social interaction. Therefore, the study suggests that CS serves for communicative purposes in a way that is exploited as a tool for transference of meaning.

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: August 31, 2023

Revised: October 27, 2023

Accepted: October 30, 2023

#### Keywords:

Code-switching; Bilingual resource, Applied conversation analysis approach; Monolingual context

**To cite this article:** de la Fuente, T.E. G. (2023). Code-switching as a linguistic resource in an EFL context at a language center in Mexico. *Erudita: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 106-118. <https://doi.org/10.28918/erudita.v3i2.2152>

**To link to this article:** <https://e-journal.uingusdur.ac.id/erudita/article/view/erudita321>



Copyright © 2023 Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

## Introduction

Despite the criticisms that have been traditionally disputed against the students' use of the L1 in the classroom, as it is viewed negatively since the objective is to maximize the use of the target language (Cook, 2001). Research such as the study carried out by (Mugla & Seedhouse, 2005), teachers use CS as an interactional resource and as an effective pedagogical tool to achieve their desired objectives (Turnbull & Arnet, 2002). Other scholars (Ariffin & Hussin, 2011; Becker, 2001; Chimbganda & Mokgwathi, 2012; Moghadam, Samad, & Shahraki, 2012; Hisham Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009; Lee, 2001; Mugla & Seedhouse, 2005; Qing, 2010; and Yao, 2011), favor CS as a pedagogical instrument since its usefulness is demonstrated in each study

in aiding both English language teaching and learning. Furthermore, in supporting the existence of CS in the EFL classroom, Skiba (1997) suggests that in "the circumstances where code-switching is used due to an inability of expression, it serves for continuity in speech instead of presenting interference in language". Subsequently, CS is a useful resource in supporting communication of information as in social interaction; therefore, it serves as a tool in transmitting meaning. Thus, this notion leads to the idea that CS fills a gap from what is not known to the familiar and may be considered as an essential tool in language learning and teaching when used appropriately. CS can no longer be considered interference errors or fossilization, but "bilingual resources" (Jenkins, 2006; Seidelhofer, 2001) but as a strategy that learner's resort to, intentionally or unconsciously, to achieve their communicative goals within the classroom.

This study acknowledges that CS can be used by monolinguals when changing styles, (Martin, 1999a; Auer, 1998) but the scope is narrowed down to the alternation between two languages, specifically Spanish and English in Mexico. The alternation of L1 and L2 in the classroom is generally known as code-switching (Martin, 1999b; Milroy and Muysken, 1995; Auer, 1998). Therefore, I adhere to the definition that code-switching since it takes into account the abilities that multilingual speakers have to switch within or between sentences from and to the codes in their repertoire (Corcoll-Lopez & Gonzalez-Davies, 2015).

According to Sert (2005), "in ELT classrooms, code-switching comes into use either in the teachers' or the students' discourse". These CS functions are used by both parties as they switch codes to perform longer turns, avoid breakdowns in communication, or to fill in lexical or grammatical gaps in L2. CS is also used to negotiate meaning and language as well as manage the tasks and classmates (Sert, 2005). Further, CS seems to be found in the discourse of students with different levels (e.g., beginning and intermediate) of English as they recur to these interactional resources for different purposes in the classroom, and the teachers who recur to them for giving instructions or teaching new vocabulary and grammar (Amorim, 2012). This theoretical grounding is supported by the various empirical investigations reviewed above. Therefore, a call for a more holistic approach where both teachers and learners are aware of these multilingual resources and the teacher has the opportunity to implement these for a more integrated language curriculum. The limited amount of research focusing on CS in the EFL classroom in the Mexican, context, and the region in general has resulted in a research gap. The number of studies in CS in English and Spanish is very limited and it can be said the same of research in CS or applied Conversation Analysis (CA).

## Method

A descriptive case study was chosen as the research paradigm for this study since the researcher described and interpreted what took place in the second language context regarding the code-switching interactional practices that students use to participate in the EFL context (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). Accordingly, in order to describe these ways, observation sessions were carried out as these depictions demonstrated what was taking place in the EFL classroom. Field notes are used to triangulate data; therefore, a more in-depth and rich analysis is brought forth as to how these resources are used. Classroom data is analyzed using an applied CA approach as it provides an emic understanding of what the learners' language practices are within the classroom context to communicate.

### **Participants**

I have chosen two classes that represent the ways in which students use CS. There is a 3<sup>rd</sup> level (CEF B1) and a 4<sup>th</sup> level (CEF B2) class. The participants from the first excerpt are *Cesar, Daniela, Socorro, Merary, and Elva*, four female and one male. Their ages are between 18- 28 years old. The participants in the second excerpt are five: *Tania, Janliek, Roman, Karen, and Diana*, four female and one male, their ages ranging from 18-23 years of age. All the participants are Mexican and for ethical reasons, these are not the participants' real names. A letter of consent was also signed by the students. The participants were chosen because of their disposition to participate in the on-going interaction of the classroom task assigned and discussed in class that day. The specifics of each classroom such as topics and classroom organization are addressed in detail before each excerpt described below.

### **Research context**

The research takes place at the Language Center of the Autonomous University of Baja California (UABC, as known by its Spanish initials), that caters diverse language courses to both students and the local community. The UABC's importance as the main public higher education institution cannot be underrated. All of the student participants were students of different fields within the university, the field of language teaching and translation studies, as well as the general public. The language center helps them prepare for the challenges of what is to come in their distinct fields as well as taking their exit exam to obtain their degree.

### **Data collection**

The data was collected over a one-year period in a three-stage process (initial, intermediate, and final) and derived from two sources of data: classroom observations and field notes. At the beginning stage, the students were invited to participate in the on-going research. Once they agreed on being part of this study along with the minutiae of steps taken to guarantee their anonymity, a letter of consent was signed. Pseudonyms were used to ensure the participants' confidentiality. During this data collection period, the observation and audio-recording of the classes of ten teachers in an EFL context in a higher education language center were carried out. Comprehensive field notes (i.e., systematic and comprehensive description of all classroom events) consisted of the general information of the class, number of students, seating lay-out, activities, language used, and verbal and non-verbal interactions (Creswell 2012; Seidman, 2013:7). Classroom observations and field notes allowed me to capture a more holistic perspective on classroom language, analyzing the teacher and student language used throughout each lesson, from opening to closing (Le Compte & Preissle, 1993; Spradley, 1980).

### **Data analysis**

The interaction of the classroom observations was then analyzed using an Applied Conversation Analysis Approach it will yield an explanation of the practices at hand that enable the participants of a conversation to negotiate meaning and field notes to gain a more holistic understanding of what is taking place in these EFL classrooms. An applied CA approach means that I will borrow tools from CA that will enable me to fulfill and demonstrate the complexities of the classroom interaction. This approach will be utilized to explicate the classroom data since this approach exposes the multileveled interpretations that can be made of

conversations as discourses (Sacks, 1984). By borrowing tools of CA, I will investigate how features of conversation, how it is generated and constructed, how it operates, and what its distinguishing characteristics are and how participants construct their own meanings in the conversational exchange (Seedhouse, 2004). I triangulated this data from the ten classroom observations and after the different rounds of analysis, three communicative functions of CS are present: *reiteration, socializing and equivalence*. Detailed accounts and extracts of the classroom interaction are provided to strengthen both the discussions and the arguments.

## Findings and discussion

### *Third level classroom (B1 CEF)*

This first excerpt is from a third level (B1 CEF) EFL classroom. Class is held from 3-5 p.m. Monday, Wednesday and Friday. The first part of the class is observed from 3:00 to 3:50 on a Wednesday afternoon. The classroom dynamic followed this pattern: Class began punctually and they worked until 3:50 when they took a break for 10 minutes. The focus of the class is to discuss a reading exercise related to organ donations using the "What would you do if...?" structure. The learners read the short article in their textbooks and then they are to discuss in their tables what they would do in diverse situations regarding the donation of organs. The classroom organization is divided in four tables with 4 students in *Table 1*, *Table 2* had five students, *Table 3* had five, and *Table 4* had five students totaling 19 students present in class. After their discussion, Pamela takes the floor to wrap-up the discussion and obtain feedback from the four groups.

1 PAM: So (.) what do you think? Would you donate your organs? It is controversial (.) Some people are against and some are for donating (.) what is your view of this? Get together in groups of four and discuss your answers.

[*The students start setting-up as they start to work with the students closest to them and begin to group. There is some noise as chairs begin to be moved by students as they organize*]

2 ARE: sometimes (.) maybe but if you don't try to talk the people, *eeh hablar con ellos para hacerlo* to join us or come with us and help us but a lot of people they don't want to... to help you, they don't care if you are going to do it,

3 OLI: yeah (.) yeah they don't care.... *no les importa.... para nada*

4 DAV: and it's bad,

5 OLI: Yeah, and donate my organs, once I considered, actually I was almost to sign but I was afraid, I was like fifty years and I was <ahh I don't know, I don't want to die" I think> I was thinking if that I sign this it's like (.) they were going to trap me there but now I want to (.)to sign that so, I can donate my organs and I think it's pretty cool because I'm not going to use them when I'm dead so,

6 DAV: well I think a lot of people they doesn't donate because they don't believe or think it is needed,

7 OLI: yeah (.) because their religion... *religión...es religión verdad?*

8 SAL: yea but for me, I don't, I don't, I'm not, I'm not good at religion but,

9 ARE: but why?

10 SAL: because... I don't know I don't know... I am a(.) I'm, I can help people, but when I donate my organs, I don't feel, I don't know, I'm scared... I'm scared because if you donate your organs, I don't know your heart or something and then people they don't use it for a good... you know?

11 ARE: yeah, for a good reason, *por una buena razón,*

12 SAL: yeah (.) so sometimes I think, but I don't know I'm not really sure maybe I'll donate when I'm passed away, when I die maybe, *cuando este bien muerto!*

13 OLI: No, but you have to sign before you die that -

14 SAL: yeah (.) but I think, yeah I'm really, really *muerto!* bien muerto....*no vaya siendo!* ((laughter))

15 OLI: maybe you know, (2.2)

*(Oli looks around the classroom to see if there is a reaction to her comment and looks over at Pamela directly for feedback)*

17 OLI: Maybe you know, maybe I give a letter to my family and say okay donate my... organs, *organos* (.) *asi se dice* teacher?

18 PAM: organs,

19 Man: my organs, but I don't know, I have to be thinking about it because, you never know maybe the person that have your heart, they are going to use it for something bad or yeah you have to know?

20 PAM: You watch too much television (.)you have an active imagination!

*(The whole class laughs and looks around the classroom to observe their classmates faces and reactions to the teachers comment)*

21 SAM: yeah, because, I don't know just, you have to, there is a few population that can't donate their organs like only if you are, if you are dead, because something in your brain, only of that, it cannot (.) if you have a bullet or a car accident or something you cannot donate your organs, only if it's something in your brain, so (.) no it is, is very rude if you die about that, only if you got a cancer in your brain or paralyzed, you have to or you can't, it can be rude, sad to have a death line dead.

22 PAM: No (.) brain dead, it is called being brain dead,

23 SAM: (.) I think I'm donating only for my family, if your family have accident or something, I mean it's your family, you'll have to do it but mm for another person, you never know the person who is so you know? It's like if, like if <ohh! man I have to thinking about that>, you never know, *la verdad uno nunca sabe! dios no lo quiera!*

25 DAV: yeah, I'm think saying like you, if you had a sister or brother that need something for you, you will have to do it, I would not think twice, *no dudaria en donar... al instante!*

26 SAM: yeah, I don't know we think, different,

27 ARE: i think I would donate, yeah to everyone who need it (.)

29 PAM: yes, I think that we need to be aware that we can help people that are in need by doing this act of charity. So many people are dying because they do not have sufficient donors; it is something to definitely reflect on, especially here in Mexico. It is still quite new here in our country. Any other comments before we wrap-up this section and take our break?

30 LL: not really,

31 PAM: *(Pamela looks around to verify if there are any questions and gestures with her face if there are any comments to the discussion)*

32 ARE: no, just to donate, we would be saving lives, we have to open up to this new way of helping people, just do it!

33 PAM: ok (.) arely.... good feedback, let's take our ten-minute break and when we come back, we will continue with this unit, pg. 67 in your textbook.

*(The students are fidgeting because they are about to take their break and start getting up to leave the class-room, the students start to move around in their chairs and begin to talk with classmates).*

This extract presents diverse CS functions evident in this classroom interaction between students and the teacher, the students and the rest of the class. This reveals there is great amount of cooperation and co/construction between all the parties involved in the on-going discussion. The focus is on students CS as the prevailing resources to communicate in this extract are reiteration, floor-holding, and socializing. They are identified and analyzed as follows:

### *Reiteration*

This is the predominant function in this intermediate classroom. The students use this as a communicative strategy not only for interaction with the teacher, but with the rest of the class as well. It is important to highlight that the reiteration function refers to the CS situation in which L1 is used when the messages have already been expressed in L2, yet they are clarified or emphasized in L1. This CS function can be identified in (*Turns 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, and 25*).

Pamela's introduction in (*turn 1*) gears Arely to respond in (*turn 2*) to the class discussion regarding the donations of organs. Pamela states that it is a controversial topic, so she gives room for the students to give their views on this by "opening up" the "floor". To her open question, Arely self-selects to respond, by indirectly aligning with those who are in favor of donating organs. Her answer that they should try "if you don't try to "talk to the people" and "es...hablar con ellos...para hacerlo"; her idea first expressed in English, is then reiterated in the L1. Though the message has already been transmitted in one code, the message is reinforced in the native language. This repetition technique allows the participant to give meaning. Arely recurs to CS in order to indicate to Pamela that the content is clearly understood by her.

A similar use is reported in Sert's (2005) study where learners prefer to make their points clear by using a reiteration technique in L1 and has been expressed previously in the L2. In (*turn 1*), Salvador expresses a concern. He is worried about the fact that some people do, so Arely emphasizes the point by adding that they should be used (organs), - "for a good reason.... *por una buena razón...*" first in L2, and then in Spanish to reiterate this point. This switch from L1 to L2 indicates the speaker's affection towards a certain individual as well as the statement being highlighted in two languages (Anderson, 2006). This is also evident in my fieldwork, even though Arely is not sitting near Salvador, she wants to evidence that she indeed understands his point and does so by gesturing with her hands in the air to Salvador. She genuinely wants Salvador to see that she understands his concern and she does this by completing his sentence, or by what she interprets what Salvador wants to say by CS to stress this particular statement. The interaction between Arely and Salvador continues with his concern (*Turn 12*) when I die maybe.... "*cuando este bien muerto*"... and (*Turn 14*) yeah I'm really, really *muerto....bien muerto....no vaya siendo...* where Salvador continues with his notion of being scared and that he would donate only when he is "dead", "really dead" causing the class to laugh with his comment.

Again, Salvador reiterates his thoughts first in L2 and then again in L1. This particular use of CS concurs with what (Gal 1979, Skiba, 1997) calls a 'semantic significance', where the switch is used to signal the speaker's attitude, communicative intentions, and emotions to convey social both social and linguistic information. In this case, Salvador switches to L1 to convey his attitude or emotions regarding organ donation to his classmates and teacher. In (*turn 21*), Salvador comments that it is sad to not be able to donate due to a sickness or an

accident where the organ is destroyed or unable to function properly and "sad to have a "death line dead", where Pamela promptly clarifies and reiterates the word "brain dead" in L2 to Salvador in (*turn 21*), as her intervention is to make meaning clear in an efficient way for both Salvador and his classmates. Therefore, Pamela clarifies guiding the attention of Salvador to the new lexical item by modeling and emphasizing accordingly in the L2. My fieldwork depicts Pamela gesturing and pointing to her head as describing the inability of the brain to work properly. *Turn 22* is taken by Samuel where he comments that if he had to donate for his family he would, because, "you never know.... *La verdad uno nunca sabe....Dios no lo quiera*"!! Highlighting the idea that organ donation may be misused if put in the wrong hands and that it is best if it is donated within the immediate family. It may be superstition on his behalf, but many Mexicans have diverse superstitions about the after-life. Even though the particular function carried out by Samuel was reiteration, he emphasized with the expression "that no one really knows" what will happen, as this particular comment he uses in Spanish is a typical one in Mexico. This is to state that, "hopefully nothing will happen and God will not permit anything bad to happen". This is a very common expression used by many Mexicans as they invoke God to prevent anything bad to happen, regardless of their religious orientation. This may be a very "cultural" thing to state in conversations both inside and outside the classroom.

This switch could be considered a socializing function since it appears to create a sense of identity or associate certain cultural aspects within a particular social group. The last use of CS can be observed in (*turn 24*), where David carries out a reiteration function to agree with Samuel's contribution in (*turn 22*) regarding his choice of donating organs. David does this by first say agreeing with a "yeah" the beginning of the turn and then, "I would not think twice... *no dudaria en donar... al instante*". He does this to stress his particular view on donating and code-switches to L1 to get his message across.

In a similar vein, this particular strategy is also carried out by both teachers and students in a study by Taha (2008) in the Arabian context, where they first used English to emphasize the point and then repeated in Arabic. This CS function is vastly used in this classroom context by students for classroom interaction and expressing ideas and negotiating meaning.

### *Equivalence*

Olimpia, in (*turn 7*) comments on David's intervention stating that some people do not donate since they do not believe in doing so, or that they do not believe it is necessary. Olimpia then intercedes and says "yeah because their relation... religion...*es religion verdad?*" as she uses the equivalence of the lexical item in L2 and then asks Pamela if that is the adequate manner to say "religion". This is a resource used by Olimpia as she code-switches when she is unable to find or is doubtful about the appropriate terminology or identical word (s) from the L2 vocabulary repertoire to match the word(s) of their L1. In (*turns 15*), she is setting up the scenario to then introduce her opinion in (*turn 17*). She shows that she is unsure about how to say "organs" as she asks Pamela to confirm the word that she has used, "donate my organs... *organos... asi se dice teacher?*" as the lexical item is reiterated in L2 by Pamela in (*turn 18*). This equivalence switch is done by Olimpia since she makes use of the native equivalent of a certain lexical item in L2 and therefore code-switches to her L1. It is argued by Sert (2005), that this process is related to the 'weakness in linguistic competence of the target language,' which makes the student use the native lexical item when he/she has not the competence for

using the target language explanation for a particular lexical item" (pg. 4). Therefore, equivalence functions as a type of defensive mechanism or as a stalling device for learners as it provides them the opportunity to continue with communication by aiding the rift resulting from not knowing the lexical item. Students nominated themselves for turns, as the teacher did not directly nominate.

#### ***Fourth level classroom (B1 CEF)***

The second excerpt is from a fourth level (B1 CEF) EFL and class is held from 9:00-11:00 A.M. weekdays, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday. The first fifty minutes of class time was observed. The classroom flow is the same as *Excerpt 1*, with a classroom break at 9:50; and then continues through until 11:00. The organization of the classroom layout is in 6 rows. The class observed is oriented towards discussing and reviewing the topic: "Pet Peeves". This is an opening sequence where Laura sets-up the procedural content as the dynamics of the teaching consists of whole class, pair and group work where the learners have the opportunity to engage in classroom interaction.

The classroom event incorporates Laura's interactions with the learners as there are 38 turns in the classroom interactional data. This is followed by student discussions and wrap-up from the teacher. There are a total of 98 turns in this classroom interaction, and only 40 are selected since they provide evidence of learner CS functions that take place. The CS functions most used by students are discussed in this next section. The student participants are Jorge, Cesar, Daniela, Socorro, Merary, and Elva. Three belong to the (*Formal population- Finance Department*) and the other three belong to the (*Informal population*).

1 LAU: Ok! That do you think about pet peeves? These are things that drive us crazy! That we cannot tolerate in other people what do you think about this?

2 MER: Okay.

3 LAU: Don't mind then, just talk!

4 LL: Okay!

((*There are laughs and they start murmuring*))

5 JOR: You first.

6 CES: Okay

7 DAN: You only?

((*Everyone in class starts discussing about the topic*))

8 SOC: Ah! Okay (.) what really gets me mad, bien, super *enojada*... is when the waitress and the personal take so long, it's very *irrespetuoso*.. disrespectful for the customers.

((*Everyone begins to laugh and murmuring*))

9 DAN: ohh okay, but we have to get use to the slow service sometimes and this, to start to not to get mad, we need to be patient.

10 LAU: okay, another answer/comment? or it's the same?

11 JOR: the same, the same in this group,

12 LAU: okay (.) *este*, how about this group?

13 SOC: you have to use one of these from the textbook? You have to start with these?

14 MER: okay, (.) for me in a restaurant, it makes me so mad! very slow service and they bring you the wrong food, the wrong order!

15 DAN: no, no (.) you can't believe what happened to me in Manzanilla! everything was burnt and I sent the order back and the chef would not accept, it was terrible.... *y tan caro que esta!* ((tr.: *and how expensive it is*))

16 SOC: in that restaurant, *en ese restaurant! es puro bluff. De esos restaurantes verdad?* The famous chef? (Socorro looks over at Daniela and laughs as she gestures being a princess and curtsies. The class starts to laugh)

17 LAU: okay, okay, everyone has had bad experiences in restaurants!

18 CES: (*murmuring*) you have to be diplomatic, not stupid in restaurants...

((*Everybody laughs*))

19 MER: Okay, something that gets on my nerves, is when (.) when the customer mocks its waiter, for example,

20 SOC: when the customer?

21 DAN: yes (.) mocks, when the customer mocks, *burlarse?* when the customer mocks to the waiter,

22 JOR: Oh (.)okay,

23 ELV: Maybe (.) the customer, the waiter, beginning, I know, e elva and I am to.. attempt, attention! but the customer, when she mocks, she says: *I am Elva and I,*

24 CES: Usually, when I get a, am get nervous, when I, I, when I go to the United States and I go to a restaurant and they try to talk everything in English so I got, they put me very nervous because sometimes I forget the, the name on the.. food (.) so.. that's where I do it, sometimes I get really nervous and I feel they mock me. *Ayy este!*, this guy, *no sabe nada, han de pensar!*

25 ELV: for me, what really piss me off at a restaurant is (.) people talking about disgusting things when you are eating, so that's, Oh sorry teacher! it makes me mad! *me enoja!*

(*There is laughter in the classroom by her classmates and they all turn to look at the teacher, meanwhile Laura eye-balls her and Elva knows that something was not appropriate in her comment*)

26 LAU: another one?

27 MER: I will tell you what really gets on my nerves, I hate when the clothes are not, are not in their places or in order, is not only confusing me, is also inconsiderate when, when people, ah! is also inconsiderate, to not put everything back,

28 DAN: what really makes me mad, when there is not an employee to help, maybe I need a size and the employee (.) never attention, or a, or attend me,

29 JOR: I can't, when I go, I can't understand why? when I go to the store, the, the price is high! that is not the case,

30 MER: is not the correct one, not the case to discuss,

31 CES: i know, but things are very expensive now, is not the correct and I have to go to pay and they say *<you need more money to pay this>*, you know? yeah, so sometimes, I just don't!

(*They laugh*)

32 LAU: ok, driving, for me Oh my God! okay, driving with slow drivers!

33 MER: yes, teacher in the fast line!

34 CES: some others, some others drivers drive too slow!

(*Cesar laughs*)

35 ELV: I hate that!

*(They laugh, and start simulating the noise of a car, everybody starts joking and laughing)*

36 SOC: when some people, their kids are, they are driving and their kids are in the front with them driving,

37 DAN: yeah, they are driving too!

38 SOC: no, they are driving with their kids here in Ensenada in front of the car! *ayy no tienen abuela!* they have no shame!

*(The class starts laughing and three students look over at Laura since Socorro made a comment she was not supposed to and Laura just laughs but signals to Socorro that was not appropriate)*

39 ELV: so? almost?

*(Laura laughs and holds up her hands gesturing for the class to continue like hopeless because Elva is a little hyper to continue.)*

### *Reiteration*

In this extract, both English and Spanish are used. However, they do not have the same status, as they are used for different communicative reasons and are discussed in detail in this section. This episode begins with Laura setting up the procedural content to be discussed in (*turn 1*), then the interaction begins and shifts between Merary (*turn 2*), Laura again in (*turn 3*) telling them to “*just talk*”, then over to an unidentified group of students who start laughing and begin to turn to each other to begin the discussion in (*turn 4*). The exchange continues with between Jorge, Cesar, and Daniel, in (*turns 5-7*) who are going back and forth deciding who will be the next participant. These exchanges take place in L2 as it is the language of instruction expected in class. It is not until (*turn 8*), where Socorro gets the discussion going putting a stop to the banter between her classmates on deciding who takes a turn or not. She starts her turn in English then switches to Spanish to emphasize the fact that that she gets mad when the waiters take so long to serve, “Ah! okay, what really gets me mad... *bien, super enojada...* is when the waitress take so long”. Socorro switches back to L2 to continue with the on-going sequence of providing her answer and then switches back to Spanish and L2 to finish her turn: “it’s very *irrespetuoso..* disrespectful for the customers”. Even though the message has been expressed, reiterated and understood by her classmates and teacher, Socorro “smuggles” (Probyn, 2009) in Spanish to express her dissatisfaction regarding the wait in being served in restaurants. This hints that Spanish is the orientation of expressing feelings and concerns as other research in other contexts (Corcoll-Lopez & Gonzalez-Davies, 2016; Sampson, 2011) where the L1 is the language of choice to communicate.

### *Socializing*

This socializing CS function occurs in (*turn 15*) as Daniela offers her answer by narrating her experience in a local restaurant named Manzanilla. In this turn, she goes beyond stating her position and provides an account for it in English, but then concludes her sequence with L1: “*y tan caro que esta!*” meaning that the restaurant is very expensive and the service was terrible because the food was burnt and was sent back to the chef who would not accept it. Daniela used a socializing CS function from the target language to the native language, to express her feeling of displeasure. This is also called “affective functions of CS” by Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult (1999) as students express their emotions as they interact with each other. The socializing use of CS in (*turn 16*) can be observed. Socorro co-constructs interaction with Daniela by providing a second part to her story imitated in the previous turn. Socorro expands her comment in English and then reiterates it in L1. She negatively assesses the fact that

these “types of restaurants” are considered to be “elitist” or “snobbish”, *es puro bluff... de esos restaurantes verdad?*, but automatically switches back to L2 to ask for confirmation about the famous chef from Ensenada and the owner of Manzanilla, “*the famous chef?*”

In this case, this CS function is performing a social action or develops a sense of group solidarity, often occurring in jokes (Sampson, 2011). This is done so rapport can be established when the group responds to a similar switch that builds solidarity and conveys friendly relations (Sert, 2005). Daniela does this to establish a sort of “solidarity” with those by explaining to her classmates that background to the restaurant and the chef, as she wants her classmates to understand and sympathize along with her, the terrible experience she had. My fieldwork also depicts Socorro looking over at Daniela to gesture as if being a princess and mocks the chef by bowing as if he were some sort of “royal” as also stated in the classroom transcription. These non-verbal acts made the class laugh at what Daniela was trying to get across with her intervention, and she made this very clear with her humor.

In (turn 24), Cesar clearly exploits this humor in his “wordplay” at the end of the sentence where switches and mixes L1 and L2 in a creative manner, by joking. What is noticeable here is that even though, “*Ayy este, this guy.. no sabe nada...han de pensar!*” is at the end of the sentence; it is not fulfilling a floor-holding position. In this turn, Cesar recalls situations in American restaurants or stores where he feels insecure about his linguistic capacity as he perceives the he is mocked by the people there. He voices what he imagines people say and think about him by using direct speech in L1 (“*Ayy este, this guy.. no sabe nada...han de pensar!*”). His final assessment about the others’ assigned behaviors (*deben de pensar*); reinforces this socializing function of CS. It is evident that the CS does not originate from a lexical deficit but from a desire to continue with the on-going interaction without pausing. Liebscher and Dailley-O’Cain (2005, p.239) define it as a “process in native speakers when they perform audible word searches”.

In Laura’s case, prohibiting L1 in the classroom would most likely be replaced by silence from the learners and would not recur to these CS resources wishing to continue with the unfolding interaction. The last turn in this excerpt, is Socorro’s intervention that begins in (turn 36) and concludes in (turn 38), where she expresses her concern regarding children that are not seated where they are supposed to, and end up in front of the car driving with their parents.

Her concern and disagreement with children driving up front with their parent is evidenced by the last comment in her turn “*ayy no tienen abuela*”. This is a very common expression in Mexico for stating that (the parents) have “no shame” in doing this. She does this by raising her tone and using L1 to create a sense of emotion as it is triggered by this CS. This expression is used in Mexico to state the fact that some people just have no shame and this is most common expression to convey this feeling without sounding harsh or abrupt since this is the equivalent of a bad word. Scholars such as (Dewaele and Wei, 2014; Pavlenko 2005; and Dewaele, 2010) indicate the relationship between certain languages and emotions in the learners’ linguistic repertoire as they are more multidimensional and complex (Kharkhurin & Wei, 2014). Therefore, some emotions may provoke more CS in some, while in others it may inhibit some orientation to a particular language. In other words, Socorro’s negative view of children driving in front with their parents facilitates this switch to L1 to highlight her point as well as provide some humor in class.

### *Equivalence*

This following turn (*turn 21*) illustrates how Daniela responds to Merary's and two other students' contributions (*turns 19 and 20*), by giving an equivalence function. Merary initiates in (*turn 19*) by stating that something that gets on her nerves is when the customers mock their waiters, which in turn, two other unidentified students take the floor, (*turn 20*) to ask quite surprisingly if it is the waiter that does that by raising their intonation. Daniela takes the floor in the next turn by stating her position in English in an affirmative way by switching and giving the equivalence in L1 mid-sentence "*when the customer mocks... burlarse?*" She then emphasizes the last part of the sentence in L2. Using an L2 equivalent is quicker and less ambiguous to paraphrase in L1 (Sampson, 2011).

As the continued sequence of interventions is taking place between the class participants, Elva's turn (*turn 25*) has two noteworthy situations: Elva goes beyond stating her opinion on people talking about disgusting things when they are eating and provides a personal account for it by exclaiming in a high tone "*what really pisses me off*" in L2 and then she notices that the expression or outburst was perceived by her classmates as "funny". She also notices that Laura eye-balls her in a way that suggests that her expression is out of place in the classroom context. She then apologizes and continues to close her turn with her choice of L2 and then her reiteration in L1. Elva chooses this expression or play of words in L2 suggesting that she feels comfortable using expressions in the target language and the fact that her classmates share the same understanding in her choice of words or expressions.

### **Conclusion**

In this study, I aimed to identify and analyze the code-switching interactional patterns that the students use to participate in the classroom such as reiteration, equivalence, floor-holding and socializing in a language center in an EFL context on the border with the U.S. This study directly impacts the field of language education amongst others, as a need to look beyond further and explore what other pedagogic resources are accessible in adjustable, contemporary approaches and methods to teaching and learning languages multilingually. Accordingly, classroom data revealed teachers challenge the status quo of teaching through a "prescribed" method, challenging the monolingual fallacy in these EFL classrooms. The evidence also suggests the need for a shift in teaching by taking a more pragmatic approach towards the use of multilingual resources.

### **References**

- Ariffin, K., & Susanti Husin, M. (2011). Code-switching and code-mixing of English and *Bahasa Malaysia* in content-based classrooms: Frequency and attitudes. *Linguistics Journal*, 5(1), 220-247. <https://openurl.ebsco.com/EPDB%3Agcd%3A10%3A9338250/detailv2?sid=ebsco%3Aplink%3Ascholar&id=ebsco%3Agcd%3A90680627&crl=c>
- Auer, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. Routledge.
- Becker, R. R. (2001). Spanish-English code switching in a bilingual academic context. *Reading Horizons*, 42(2), 99-115. [https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading\\_horizons/vol42/iss2/3](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol42/iss2/3)

- Chimbganda, A. B., & Mokgwathi, T. S. (2012). Code-switching in Botswana's ESL classrooms: A paradox of linguistic policy in education. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(2), 21-32. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n2p21>
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- Corcoll-Lopez, C., & González-Davies, M. (2015). Switching codes in the plurilingual classroom. *ELT Journal*, 70(1), 67-77. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv056>
- Moghadam, S. H., Samad, A. A., & Shahraki, E. R. (2012). Code switching as a medium of instruction in an EFL classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(11), 2219-2225. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.11.2219-2229>
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 137-162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2006.00111.x>
- Lee, K. O. (2001). *Three ESL teachers' reflections upon their beliefs toward communicative language teaching and classroom practices: A multiple case study* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska]. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/dissertations/AAI3022644>
- Liebscher, G., & Dailey O'Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(2), 234-247. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3588683>
- Martin, P. (1999a). Bilingual unpacking of monolingual texts in two primary schools in Brunei Darussalam. *Language and Education*, 13(1), 35-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500789908666758>
- Martin, P. (1999b). Close encounters of a bilingual kind: International practices in the primary classroom in Brunei. *International Journal of Education Management*, 19(2), 127-140. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593\(98\)00057-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(98)00057-1)
- Mugla, E. Ü., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(3), 302-325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00093.x>
- Qing, X. U. (2010). To switch or not to switch: Examine the code-switching practices of teachers of non-English majors. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(4), 109-113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.css.1923669720100604.011>
- Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classrooms. *Online Submission*, 11(8). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED496119>
- Sampson, A. (2011). Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal*, 66(3), 293-302. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr067>
- Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 3(10), 1-6. <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Skiba-CodeSwitching.html>
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 204-218. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000119>
- Yao, M. (2011). On attitudes to teachers' code-switching in EFL classes. *World journal of English language*, 1(1), 19-28. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v1n1p19>