

アジアにおける英語授業へのコードスイッチング導入に向けた提案

Classroom Code-Switching in Asia and Its Pedagogical Implications

白水千絵

Chie SHIRAMIZU

概要

近年では、韓国・中国などのアジアの国々でも英語の授業内でコードスイッチングが行われており、外国語習得において重要な役割を果たすと言われている。しかし、教師にとってコードスイッチングを授業に取り入れることは難しく、その主な原因として、コードスイッチングの仕方について明確な指針がないこと、及び長期的な導入実験が実施されておらず効果が実証されていないことが考えられる。そのため本稿では、それぞれの原因に対し、学校単位でコードスイッチングのガイドラインを作成すること、及び長期に渡りコードスイッチングと言語習得との関連性・効果を検証することを提案する。

キーワード：コードスイッチング、第二言語習得、外国語習得、アジア

Abstract

Classroom code-switching (CCS) practices in the EFL classrooms have been implemented in China, South Korea and Hong Kong and are perceived to facilitate EFL classrooms. However, it is difficult for the teachers to practice CS because no clear guideline for CCS has been provided and there has been there' s little examination of the effectiveness of CCS. Therefore, it' s necessary to examine the influence of language input on students' English acquisition, i.e. whether teachers' CCS motivates students' English production and eventually contributes to their English acquisition. Also, research is needed to compare the effectiveness of L1 and L2 strategies, and also to identify more useful L1 and L2 strategies. Once the effectiveness of CCS has been established a guideline of the optimal amount of L1 will be needed for teachers to provide information on the optimal use of L1 and L2 so that EFL teachers code-switch more effectively and meaningfully.

Keywords: code-switching, optimal amount, second language acquisition, Asia, pedagogy

Table of contents

Introduction

Background of L2 only classrooms

Definition and functions of code-switching

L2 only use versus L1 use

Current implementation of CCS

Discussion

Conclusion

References

Introduction

There have been debates of L2 only use and L2 with L1 use in the ESL/EFL classrooms and neither side of the debate has proved to be more effective one way than the other. Recently, L1 use has become more the focus of the issue and Classroom Code-Switching (CCS) as a compromise has been practiced. As many researchers (Chan, C.W., 2000; Qian, 2009) discussed, code-switching has been perceived to be a facilitator in EFL classrooms. Cook (2001a) and Lu (2003) referred to code-switching in the classroom as a natural response in a bilingual situation. However, it seems to be difficult for teachers to practice CCS. Three possible reasons for this are as follows. First, not much research on the optimal amount of L1 and L2 use has been done (Liu et al., 2004) and no clear guideline for CCS has been provided. Second, there is little new insight into how existing classroom code-switching can be further changed to achieve more, and little examination of the effectiveness of CCS (Lee, 2008; Lin, 2008; Liu, et al., 2004). Lastly, many governments have taken the stance that an L2 only environment is the best way to learn English; therefore, they oppose the use of CCS (Lee, 2008; Meij, 2010; Yamada & Hristoskova, 2011).

This paper reviews the literature on CCS in Asia, and argues that based on how CCS is practiced, it can facilitate L2 learning. The first section will give a definition of CCS and a background of L2 only use and will also discuss the usage of L1 and L2 only. After that, it will highlight some key challenges of implementing CCS in schools, providing examples from Korea, China, Japan and Hong Kong. The paper will conclude with a discussion of suggestions for educational policy changes and classroom adaption of meaningful CCS.

Background of L2 only in classrooms

The L2- only position dates back to the 1880's, when the *direct method* emerged as a popular L2 teaching approach (Cook, 2001b). In this method, language teaching is conducted in L2 only and engages students in natural language use, rather than using analytical procedures that focus on an explanation of grammar rules (Richards & Rodgers, 1986, p.9). Other contemporary methods of the L2-only approach are, *total physical response* (Asher, 1993) and *the natural approach* (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). A major theoretical underpinning for the L2-only position, is that (a) such a practice completely immerses learners in the language, providing them with necessary language input and making languages learning meaningful and effective, and (b) using L1 in the classroom subverts the language acquisition process by denying learners valuable L2 input (Chambers, 1991; Ellis, 1988; Krashen, 1982; Macdonald, 1993). As Krashen and Terrell (1983) stated, L2 teaching must place “input in a central place in the curriculum and should make the classroom the source of input for the language students, a place where they can obtain the comprehensible input necessary for language acquisition” (p.59).

Definition and functions of code-switching

Code-Switching (CS) is a common phenomenon of language contact in bilingual, multilingual and even monolingual societies. It is generally understood as the alternative use by bilinguals (or multilinguals) of two or more languages in the same conversation. Classroom Code-Switching (CCS) refers to the altering use of more than one linguistic code in the classroom participants (e.g. teacher, students, teacher aid). Code switching is defined as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (Gumperz, 1982:, p.59). More briefly stated, it is altering use of more than one language within a single discourse (Heller, 1988; Hoffman, 1991; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Poplack, 1980), which includes the use of complete sentences, phrases and borrowed words from another language (Brice, 2000). Sankoff and Poplack (1981) identify three types of CS; tag-switching, intra-sentential switching and inter-sentential switching. Tag- switching involves the insertion of a tag or a short fixed phrase from one language into an utterance which is entirely in the other language. Inter-sentential switching involves a switch at a clause or sentence boundary, where each clause or sentence is either in one language or the other. It may also occur when one speaker takes up where another leaves off. Intra-sentential switching refers to switching within the clause or sentence boundary. This form involves the greatest syntactic risk and requires that the speaker be fluent in both lan-

guages.

CCS serves pedagogical functions such as translation, clarification, highlighting and efficiency in order to ensure maximum effectiveness of teaching. CCS triggered by the students' lack of comprehension performs the following functions: explaining the meaning of L2 words, explaining the L2 grammar, and making comments on the L2 culture (Macaro, 2001; Lee, 2008; Pennington, 1995). The translation of L2 utterances in L1 is considered to provide learners with an opportunity to check their understanding of the previous L2 statement (Canagarajah, 1995). Also, CCS plays a significant role in carrying out social functions such as praise, encouragement and disapproval to establish solidarity and close relationships with students (Qian, 2009; Yao, 2010). Current studies have started to categorize L2 teachers' language use as "code-switching" rather than "L1 use" based on the assumption that teachers' CCS is a bilingual strategy for communication and teaching (Macaro, 2001). This paper does not distinguish the studies that use the term "L1 use" from "code-switching".

L2 only use versus L1 use

Although the L2-only position has been widely promoted, some have begun to oppose it (Cook, 2001b; Macaro, 1997; Turnbull, 2001). Skinner (1985) contends that "the sole use of L2 as the language of instruction appears to inhibit that process" because "it obstructs the rapid connection of words with thoughts, and thereby it slows acquisition of meaning in L2," and "by retarding acquisition of meaning, L2 limits growth in concept development and cognitive language proficiency"(p.383). Other scholars (Atkinson, 1987; Cook, 2001b; Macaro, 1996, 1997) have also opposed the L2- only practice because using L1 is a natural practice in L2 learning and it is sometimes a much more time-efficient strategy than using L2 only. Still others (Cook, 2001b; Hagen, 1992) argue that L2 students will have to learn code switching to succeed in intercultural communication in our increasingly globalized world. However, none of these L1-use supporters endorses unlimited use of L1; many (Atkinson, 1987; Kharma & Hajjaj, 1989; Wells, 1999) warn against excessive L1 use, advocating, instead, an optimal use.

Others point to research indicating that the L1 is a very useful cognitive learning tool in L2 acquisition. For instance, Anton and DiCamilla's (1998) study indicates that using L1 "plays a strategic cognitive role in scaffolding" for students in their effort to accomplish learning tasks (p.319). Similarly, Brooks and Donato (1994) and Swain and Lapkin (2000) found that the L1 enables L2 students to negotiate meaning and communicate successfully in the target language. L1 is an "essential tool" in the learning process for many L2 learners as they interact with peers and teachers

(Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996, p.60), and using L1 often helps L2 learners to “create a social and cognitive place” where they can work effectively to enhance their learning (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998, p.335). Moreover, the use of L1 can make L2 input more salient for the learner, hence enhancing intake (Van Lier, 1995). From the students’ point of view, those who are in their early stages of L2 learning highly appreciated the teacher’s CCS to L1 since it reduces classroom anxiety (Auerbach, 1993; Chan, C.W., 2000). In other surveys (Chan, C.W., 2000; Takahashi, 1996) most students in elementary level classes stated that the teacher’s use of L1 helped them understand difficult L2 words and recognize class procedures, saving their time for guessing the meaning of L2 utterances.

Little research has been conducted on how much L1 is appropriate because the questions depend on the students’ level (Liu, et al, 2004) and findings concerning what types of L1 use are appropriate and effective differ considerably. For example, Castelloti (1997) cited in Turnbull & Arnett, (2002) suggests that L1 is best used when it enhances language input to help students understand, and this type of use includes checking comprehension, highlighting important points or salient vocabulary and drawing students attention. Cook (2001b) and Kharma and Hajjaj (1989) also support additional use of L1 for teaching grammar and abstract words, organizing tasks establishing teacher-student rapport, and maintaining discipline. However, Harbord (1992) groups L1 use into more limited categories; (a) facilitating teacher-student communication, (b) facilitating teacher-student rapport and (c) facilitating learning. He does not endorse the first two categories because in his view, they do not support students’ learning and should be replaced by L2 strategies. He supports the third category because it directly assists students’ language learning, but does not support its use for any other purposes, such as saving time. As Cook (2001) addresses, it is significant for the teachers to use L1 judiciously as a strategy of L2 learning in the classroom.

Similarly, little research has been conducted on how much L2 and L1 teachers usually use. For instance, Duff and Polio (1990) examined more than a dozen college foreign language teachers’ classes and found that teachers’ L1 and L2 use varied greatly. The use of L2 ranged from as high as 100% to as low as 10%. Turnbull (2000) studied the CCS practices of four teachers of French as an L2 and also found that teachers’ L2 use varied substantially. However, Macaro (2001) analyzed six student teachers’ French classes and Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002) analyzed four professors’ French classes and found less variation: The highest teacher L2 talk was 100% and the lowest was about 70% in both studies. L2 teachers’ language selection has been found to be influenced by their beliefs about L2 learning and their language preference. Macaro (2001) demonstrated how teachers’ beliefs about L2 learning influenced their language use in class and that teachers who had different approaches to L2 learning and language use code-switched differently. Teachers who had thought

that L1 had no pedagogical value and that they should maximize L2 input used the L2 throughout the class. In contrast, teachers who acknowledged the pedagogical value of L1 use strategically alternated between the L1 and the L2 according to the situations.

Current implementation of CCS

Although CCS is perceived to be effective to facilitate L2 learning, still, it seems to be difficult to practice in the classrooms. The following section will discuss situations from four countries, Korea, China, Japan and Hong Kong.

English teaching in South Korean schools has traditionally been conducted almost exclusively in Korean. In the past two decades, however, with the English education system in South Korea following the global trend in shifting from knowledge based to use oriented, the practice of using Korean to teach English has received increasing criticism from educators, students, and parents. Korean students' lack of English proficiency after studying English for years has been perceived as a failure of the education system. As a result, the Korean Ministry of Education (KMEXT) has repeatedly asked school English teachers to use English more frequently in class and to move gradually toward using it almost exclusively since they announced a policy titled Teaching English through English (TETE) in 2001. However, no specific benchmarks have been identified regarding how teachers can use English and Korean to enhance students' English skills (Liu et al, 2004). The TETE policy requires English teachers to use English as the medium of instruction (MoI) based on the assumption that maximum exposure of English will be beneficial for students' English acquisition. Lee (2008) states, as a result, teachers are being made to feel guilty for using Korean in their classrooms, even though they claim that the use of Korean can be more efficient in some circumstances. With respect to the TETE policy, Lee (2008) adds that most teachers acknowledged the importance of their using English as the MoI but showed the negative attitude on the grounds that the exclusive use of English lowered the students' motivation and cause a lack of understanding of the students with low English proficiency, that they could not determine the amount of their English due to the wide variety of the students' English levels. Kang (2008) also reports an interview statement from a teacher who says it is inefficient to conduct classes only in English as there are only a few students who understand and the other students feel easily frustrated. Therefore, classes using a mixture of Korean and English would be more efficient. Lee (2008) suggests that in order to solve the conflict between KMEXT and teachers, it is necessary to investigate the patterns of language selection in teachers' classroom discourse and the factors involved in their language alternation.

The study by Liu et al. (2004) examines teachers' CCS and focuses on the five most salient

functions; explaining difficult grammar and vocabulary, giving background information, overcoming communication difficulties, saving time, highlighting important information, and managing students' behavior. With regard to the amount of English and Korean, according to both the teachers and students, teachers should use between 50 % and 60 % of English in their talk, an amount much higher than is reported in the current practice. Most students believed that teachers' use of English had been helpful but they also believed that Korean is more effective than English for teaching grammar and vocabulary.

Liu et al. (2004) suggests that both pre-and in-service teacher training should focus on strategies for optimal L1 and L2 use because in the study, even experienced teachers sometimes switched languages for no apparent reason. Furthermore, Liu et al. (2004) points out that code-switching may need to be added as a curriculum objective because it may be a required life skill in this increasingly globalized economy. Liu et al. (2004) also emphasizes that educators at all levels should coordinate their efforts to develop guidelines for L1 and L2 uses at each grade level, and states that “these guidelines will facilitate students' language development by ensuring smooth transitions for the students and preventing any unnecessary gaps or backward steps” (p.633). Lee (2008) adds that quite a few classes have been observed and analyzed for linguistic functions for CCS; however, their study still provides only a partial or imprecise view of the classroom discourse since only one class session of each participant was recorded.

In China, similar to the case of Korea, there is widespread agreement among administrators that L1 should not be used in L2 classrooms and both teachers and students have to follow the norm. Guo (2007) addresses an absence of written guidelines and policies at the school level. The issue of code-switching was deliberately ignored in the syllabi issued in 2001 and 2004 by the Ministry of Education. In order to understand this absence, it is important to consider both China's historic context, as well as the current opportunities and challenges associated with teaching English as a foreign language in China. Historically speaking, there is a traditional teaching pedagogy in China, which is heavily influenced by Confucian ideas, on the basis of which teachers are more likely to adopt the role of imparting knowledge rather than acting as a facilitator or coach for students to construct knowledge (Ni, 2007) Regarding English education, there has been unprecedented rise in the demand for English as an L2, although there are signs that this is taxing teachers and instructional materials (Hu, 2003).

In spite of the negative attitudes of administrators toward CCS, there are some findings that CCS positively facilitates learning. Yao (2010) examined the attitude towards teachers' CCS in local secondary schools based on a sample of 52 teachers and 100 students. The data showed that about 80% of teachers 'agree' or 'strongly agree' that teachers who code-switch can express themselves

freely and clearly. As to the attitudes towards teachers' CCS when explaining grammatical points or lexical items, about 73% of the sample either 'agree' or 'strongly agree' with the opinion. The table showed that students and teachers shared similar opinions regarding most of the questions. This accordance suggests that teachers and students both have a positive attitude towards teachers' CCS. However, there are still discrepancies between the two samples, which suggests that the use of CCS should be adapted to practical teaching. Xu (2010) examined six freshmen in English classrooms at a university and found the following; teachers used on average 82% of English, their use of Chinese was very effective for several functions such as grammar instruction, clarification and building solidarity with the students; teachers' beliefs tended to affect their code-switching practices; teachers' language use appeared to affect students' language behavior in class, although students' decisions on what language to use often depended on the question's complexity and level of difficulty. With regard to the students' attitudes, more than 60% of students had a positive attitude towards teachers' CCS. Teachers often code-switched to translate or elaborate on important messages during the process of explaining new vocabulary or grammar points. This reduced the overall comprehension burden making it easier to concentrate on the core message being conveyed.

In the survey conducted by Chan, C.W.(2000), Chinese adult learners reported the positive role of bilingual teachers in helping students overcome their culture shock-related problems in the classroom such as anxiety, inhibition, low self-esteem and lack of motivation. However, the degree of contentment regarding the teacher's L1 use varied according to the learners' age and proficiency level. Teachers' CCS to L1 was more appreciated by adult learners and elementary-level students than by younger higher-level students. The study conducted in the English major courses in universities by Meij (2010) indicates that both students and teachers perceive the classroom as a compound bilingual space in which teacher CCS is desirable and functional and that students want more and longer switches from teachers.

One study by Qian (2009) presented the results of CCS between Chinese and English in primary schools. It was a six year project from the year 2003 to 2009 and altogether seven schools with 1500 pupils and 30 teachers participated in it. The results showed that CCS led to a drastic decrease of L1 use over the 4 years (1styear: 40 %, 2ndyear: below 10 %, last two years: minimum), which provides strong evidence of the success and impact of CCS: students clearly understand the L2 so teachers do not need to provide L1. It was also found that inter-sentential switching (82%) far outweighed tag-switching (2%) and intra-sentential switching (16%). Inter-sentential switching had a higher frequency of occurrence, which could be attributed to the teachers' intention of giving clearer instruction and eliciting more responses from students. Qian (2009) concludes that teachers' CS does not impede the language acquisition of learners, rather a prudent use of it helps cultivate

and reinforce good habits of learning for students and fosters healthy and close relationships, especially for students at lower levels. Qian (2009) adds that it should be noted by the teachers that only a limited or selected use of L1 or well-contemplated CS should be applied in the classroom, and that teachers should not habitually switch to the L1 to explain themselves whenever there seem to be obstacles.

In Japan, there has been an increasing emphasis on English language education by the government since the Olympics were held in Tokyo in 1964. In the 1970s and 1980s, MEXT (The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology) received many complaints that the Course of Study Guidelines, which outlines the specific goals, contents and structure of junior and senior high school English classes did not mention any need to teach English for communicative purposes (Kikuchi & Browne, 2009). The 1989 Course of Study Guidelines stated for the first time that the primary object of English education in Japan was to develop students' communicative ability in English (Yoshida, 2003), and in 2003, MEXT issued a more concrete set of goals to improve English education in Japan known as the "Action Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities" (MEXT 2003). It has been argued that no matter what reform is introduced by MEXT, there are at least three major obstacles which prevent widespread curricular reform (Gorsuch, 2001). These are the university entrance exam-oriented classes which focus on receptive skills or translation skills (Brown & Yamashita, 1995; Kikuchi, 2006); over reliance of grammar-translation activities (Gorsuch, 1998) and a severe lack of pre-and in-service teacher training (Browne & Wada, 1998).

In Japan, similar to the situation in Korea, students don't become proficient enough in English even after studying English for 6 years in junior and senior high school. Due to the high demand of English in the global society and because of the low English proficiency of students, a new Course of Study for junior and senior high schools was announced in 2009 by MEXT. It stated that English classes should be conducted in English from 2012 at junior high schools, and from 2013 at senior high schools in order to enhance opportunities for the students to be exposed to English by transforming classes into real communication scenes (MEXT 2009). The guideline states that when pursuing the acquisition of English language skills, using English as much as possible in class is important because the students' opportunities to use English in their daily lives are very limited. The guide also states that teachers can sometimes use Japanese, providing that the central focus of the lesson is language activities, but no specific guideline of L1 usage is provided, leaving it to each teacher's own judgement.

Since the announcement of the new Course of Study by MEXT, one of the most debated issues has been its requirement of the use of English, and there has also been discussion on the pros and cons of teaching and learning English in English in senior high schools. According to MEXT's sur-

vey in 2007 (MEXT, 2008), the percentage of JTEs (Japanese Teachers of English) who said they speak mostly in English is between about 20~26% in OC (Oral Communication) classes and 1~1.5% in English 1 and 2 classes, which are grammar and reading focused classes. On the other hand, the percentage of students who said they have opportunities to converse with peers in English in every class is about 5% in English 1 and 50% in the OC class. This data indicates that classes are not conducted primarily in English not even OC class, although use of English is higher in it.

This current situation may result in teachers' and students' feeling that implementing an L2 only class would be beneficial. Yamada and Hristoskova (2011) present a survey which was carried out among JTEs, ALTs (Assistant Language Teachers) and students at senior high schools in Fukui prefecture. It showed that more than 50% of the JTE's and 80% of the ALT's accept MEXT's L2 only policy, whereas 16% of JTE's and none of the ALT's disagree. The responses from students were divided into three groups based on their type of study ; (A) Students in academic courses; (I) Students in international courses majoring in English; and (V) Students in vocational courses. 34% of A students, 45% of I students and 14% students of V students said they would be greatly troubled in an L2 only class. When students were asked how they want their teachers to help them understand the teachers' English, the most preferred way was through translation, with other alternatives being to speak slowly, repeat, use easy English, use gestures, show realia and act. Also, more than 90% of JTEs agreed that explanation is often much more efficiently done in Japanese. Yamada and Hristoskova (2011) suggest that teachers use Japanese by code-switching when necessary. Yoshida and Yanase (2003) remark on two stages when Japanese can be used. First, in case of students who have acquired BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) in Japanese and are still beginning learners of English, an explanation in Japanese would be useful to develop writing skills at a BICS level. Second, when students have acquired Japanese BICS and CALP and English BICS, an effective use of Japanese would be useful.

Although little empirical research of CCS practices in Japan has been done yet, more and more experimental CCS practices at schools will undoubtedly be explored because of this new language policy.

Languages education debates in Hong Kong focus on the role and status of English, the former colonial language and an important means for international communication; Cantonese, the mother tongue of the majority of the population; and Putonghua, the national language of China. Although Cantonese is now spoken by approximately 97% of the population, it does not have as high of a status as English or as Putonghua (Morris & Adamson, 2010). As the former colonial language, English might be expected to be less important since the handover from British to Chinese sovereignty in 1997; however, English has another role, as an important language for international communica-

tion, business and academic study. This has given English a high status in Hong Kong, schools that use English as the medium of instruction (MoI) are becoming very popular with parents (Choi, 2003). However, English is not an easy language for many Hong Kong students to learn because it is very different from the Chinese language and is not commonly used for every day communication in Hong Kong (Kan & Adamson, 2010).

In 1997, the Education Department issued the “Medium of instruction guidance for secondary schools” to stop teachers from using mixed languages or code-switching. This confronted the fact that the overwhelming majority of parents, although being Chinese-speaking, believe that an English-based education will provide greater long-run economic opportunities for their children (Husock, 2000). Finally in 1998, the Hong Kong government required most of the secondary schools to switch to Chinese as the language in which all subjects were taught. The remaining schools, whose teachers demonstrated high a proficiency in English, were allowed to continue using English as the MoI (Bierma, 2005). The government’s goal was addressed by establishing a “biliterate and trilingual” society (biliteracy in English and standard Chinese; trilingualism in spoken Cantonese, Putonghua and English). Despite the government’s good intention of introducing mother-tongue teaching, Lu (2003) argues that the new policy has created problems. One point was that schools did not have adequate teaching materials in Chinese, so they had to rely on freelance translators in mainland China to translate English textbooks, sometimes with questionable accuracy. The other problem was the gulf that was created between Chinese-speaking schools and English-speaking schools. As soon as the policy was announced, admission to the English-speaking schools became highly competitive and Chinese-speaking schools were regarded as second rate. Lu (2003) also said it is the policy itself that weakens the status of its proposed Chinese-medium education. An ironic outcome of the new policy is that if students lack sufficient competence in the language that is used as the MoI, they will tend to learn superficially and to lack autonomy and self-expression (Kan & Anderson, 2010). Lu (2003) also notes that mother tongue education deprives students of the English proficiency they will need in their careers.

Before the government’s MoI policy was issued, an observational study of secondary schools by Pennington (1995) found that the teachers who taught lower level classes code-switched more often than the other teachers who were teaching more advanced students. Pennington (1995) concluded that the teachers adjusted the amount of the L2 to the learners’ level of English proficiency in order to compensate for students’ shortcomings such as a lack of English proficiency and low motivation.

After the new policy was issued, a study by Wai Kit (2000) demonstrated that primary school students showed a positive attitude towards English learning and English based-teaching. Students

were fully aware of the necessity of English as a commercial language and a learning tool. Still, students also agreed that learning in their mother tongue, Chinese, or in a mixed code of Chinese and English would reduce their learning difficulties. As a result, in learning vocabulary, they used Chinese resources to support the semantics and pronunciation of English words.

Against the background of debates concerning whether CS between L1 (Cantonese) and L2 (English) in MoI content subject lessons facilitates or hinders English language acquisition, a study was carried out by Chan, C.Y-m (2007) to find out the pedagogical functions of CS; the differences in the CS patterns used by teachers with student populations of different English proficiency levels and the insights the pedagogical functions give to classroom code-switching. The findings showed all-English, and intra-sentential code-switching with English as the Matrix code were correlated with the student population who had a high English proficiency; inter-sentential CS and intra-sentential CS with English inserted at sites at the word-level and beyond the word-level in Cantonese base structures were found with the student population who had an intermediate English proficiency. Student English proficiency levels combined with the lesson objectives and subject content were the basis for the language patterns used by the teachers. The majority of the teachers and students interviewed favored inter-sentential CS over intra-sentential CS for English language acquisition in English as the MoI for content subject classes. Chan, C.Y-m (2007) recommended that code-switching be recognized as a legitimate teaching strategy but used in a controlled manner. Moreover, a continuum of code-switching patterns with different degrees of second language penetration was proposed for students of varied English levels.

Discussion

Examples from four Asian countries imply that code-switching is considered a useful strategy in classroom interaction due to certain pedagogical functions such as translation, clarification, and social functions to establish relationships with students. However, it seems difficult to implement CCS because of various reasons, with the three main ones being discussed below. First, no clear guideline of the optimal amount of CCS, that is to say, how much teachers should code-switch in classrooms is provided. Opinions on the appropriate usage of L1 and L2 vary according to the researcher, and the language use also depends on each teacher's beliefs and cultural experience. Given the fact that no specific optimal amount of CCS is determined, it is difficult for a clear guideline to be provided.

Second, little effectiveness of CCS has been identified. Lin (2008) also emphasizes that "many researchers have studied CCS practices either to seek out their "good sense" and local rationality or

to document their pitfalls or pedagogical inefficacy.” The studies cited in literature tend not to analyze how CCS practices can be further improved to achieve better pedagogical purposes, instead, they describe existing practices with critical and interventionist research questions. Therefore, the majority of studies offer little new insight into how existing CCS can be further changed or improved. Lee (2008) also points out that whether or not teachers’ CCS contribute to learners’ English acquisition was not investigated in the study, and this point needs to be examined more in future research.

Finally, the governments of Korea, China and Japan are opposed to using L1 and advocate an L2 only policy, assuming that students will be able to develop listening and speaking skills by being exposed to an L2 only classroom environment. With regard to Hong Kong, the government supports mother tongue education and wants to abolish L2 use or CCS of L1 & L2. This could be due to lack of evidence that CCS facilitates L2 learning.

Based on the challenges noted above, two pedagogical suggestions for the practice of CCS and educational changes are as follows. First, in order for the EFL teachers to code-switch more effectively and meaningfully, an establishment of a school-based guideline of CCS is highly encouraged. As mentioned earlier, the optimal amount of L1 and L2 completely depends on the learning context, as well as the students’ proficiency levels, and ages. As a result, no fixed guideline can be created to match every context. Therefore, first, the government should mandate that each school make its own guidelines so each teacher can gradually adapt to their own classroom. Afterwards, the school-based guideline could become city/prefecture based, and finally might become the language policy of the country. The guideline should include the optimal amount, as well as the type of usage of L1 and L2, specifically, it is significant to state HOW MUCH they should code-switch as well as WHEN, for example, in what situation, they should code-switch.

Next, in order for the effectiveness of CCS to be clearly identified, we need to have longitudinal studies that follow the same classroom for a longer period of time instead of one-shot classroom video studies. It’s necessary to examine the influence of language input on students’ English acquisition, i.e. whether teachers’ CCS motivates students’ English production and eventually contributes to their English acquisition. Also, research is needed to compare the effectiveness of L1 and L2 strategies and also to identify more useful L1 and L2 strategies.

One method that can be suggested for examining the improvement of student L2 is a proficiency test. TOEIC is considered to be the most frequently used worldwide English proficiency test at the moment, however, it may not be valid enough to measure speaking skills because TOEIC measures only listening and reading skills. Since the government supports L2 only policy assuming that students will be able to develop speaking skills in an L2 only environment, it will not be convincing

unless the improvement of speaking skills are proved. Therefore, tests which can measure speaking such as TOEFL and Eiken STEP tests (this is exclusive in Japan) would be more suitable.

With regard to the third issue, the government's opposition to L1 use, it is possible that the opposition would be lessened if the effectiveness of CCS over a long period of time were examined and proved. As Lee (2008) emphasizes, observational studies of natural classroom discourse will be the first step to demonstrate to the government whether English teachers' use of the students' L1 is a helpful strategy to facilitate L2 learning.

Conclusion

This paper has reviewed the overviews and challenges of implementing CCS in Asia and some pedagogical implications were provided, however, there remain issues to be further explored. For instance, longitudinal research should be encouraged to examine the effectiveness of CCS. Importantly, there are many variations of CCS practices in terms of (1) levels; beginner, intermediate, advance, (2) ages; elementary, junior high, senior high, university, and adults, (3) pedagogical functions; clarification, translation, building solidarity and so on, (4) syntactic types; intra-sentential and inter-sentential switching, (5) interlocutors; teacher-student, student-student, (6) teaching contexts; exam-oriented or communication-oriented class, (7) teachers; native speaker or non-native speaker of L1. These detailed factors should be respectively included in future research.

References

- Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Social cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, 314-342. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.54.3.314
- Asher, C. (1993). Using the target language as the medium of instruction in the communicative classroom: The influence of practice on principle. *Studies in Modern Languages Education*, 7, 53-71.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal* 41, 421-427. doi: 10.1093/elt/41.4.241
- Auerbacher, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27 (1), 9-32. doi: 10.2307/3586949
- Bierma, N. (2005, May, 12). Hong Kong's students left at a loss for words; North final edition. *Chicago Tribune*, p.5. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb>
- Brice, A. (2000). Code-switching and code-mixing in the ESL classroom: A study of pragmatic and syntactic features. *Advances in Speech Language Pathology. Journal of the Speech Pathology Association of Australia*, 20 (1), 19-28. doi: 10.3109/14417040008996783
- Brooks, F., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77, 262-274. <http://www.jstor.org/pss/344508>
- Brown, J.D., & Yamashita, S. (1995). English language entrance exams at Japanese universities: What do we know about them? *JALT Journal*, 17 (1), 7-30. Retrieved from http://jalt.org/test/bro_5.

- htm
- Browne, C., & Wada, M. (1998). Current issues in high school English teaching in Japan: An exploratory survey. *Language, Culture & Curriculum 11* (1), 96-111. doi: 10.1080/07908319808666543
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1995). Functions of code-switching in ESL classrooms: Socializing bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 6* (3), 173-195. oi: 10.1080/01434632.1995.9994599
- Castelloti, V. and Moore, D. (1997). Alternner pour apprendre, alternner pour enseigner, denouveaux enjeux pour la classe de langue. *Etudes de Liguistique Appliquee, 108*, 389-392. Retrieved from <http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=10368330>
- Chambers, F. (1991). Promoting use of the target language in the classroom. *Language Learning Journal, 4*, 27-31. doi: 10.1080/09571739185200411
- Chan, C. W. (2000). The importance of bilingual teachers to Chinese-oriented AMEP learners. Paper presented at AMEP Conference 2000. Retrieved from <http://www.nceltr.mq.edu.au/conference2000/bilingual.doc>
- Chan, C. Y-m. (2007). *Code-switching in the Hong Kong content subject classroom: A building block or a stumbling block to English language acquisition?* Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb>
- Choi, P. (2003). The best students will learn English: Ultra-utilitarianism and linguistic Imperialism in education in post-1997 Hong Kong. *Journal of Education Policy 18*, 673-694. doi:10.1080/0268093032000145917
- Cook, V. (2001a). *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Arnold.
- Cook, V. (2001b). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57* (3), 402-423. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402
- Duff, P.A., & Polio, C.C. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language Classroom? *Modern Language Journal, 74*, 154-166. Retrieved from <http://nativelanguageuse.weebly.com/uploads/4/0/4/5/4045990/roleofnativelanguage>
- Ellis, R. (1988). *Classroom second language development*. New York: Prince Hall.
- Gorsuch, G.J. (1998). *Yakudoku* EFL instruction in two Japanese high school classrooms: An exploratory study. *JALT Journal, 20*, 6-32. Retrieved from <http://www.mendeley.com/research/yakudoku-efl-instruction-two-japanese-high-school-classrooms-exploratory-study/>
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Guo, T. (2007). *A case study of teacher's codeswitching behaviors in mainland China's university EFL classrooms and students' reactions to the codeswitching*. University of Oxford.
- Hagen, S. (1992). Language policy and strategic issues in the new Europe. *Language Learning Journal, 5*, 31-34.
- Heller, M. S. (1988). *Code-switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal, 46*, 350-355. doi: 10.1093/elt/46.4.350
- Hoffmann, C. (1991). *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Ho, W.K. (2000). *Models of bilingual memory of primary pupils in Hong Kong*. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb>
- Hu, G. (2003). English language teaching in China: Regional differences and contributing factors. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 24*, 290-318. doi: 10.1080/01434630308666503
- Husock, H. (2000). *"Mother tongue" education in Hong Kong: Convincing the public*. John F. Kennedy School of Government Case Collection. Cambridge.
- Kan, V., & Adamson, B. (2010). Language policies for Hong Kong schools since 1997. *London Review*

- of Education*, 8 (2), 167-176. doi: 10.11080/14748460.2010.487336
- Kang, I.-S. (2008). SNU staff getting rated on English and manners. *JoongAng Daily*. Retrieved from <http://joongangdaily.joms.com/article/view.asp?aid=2885444>
- Kharma, N. N., & Hajjaj, A.H. (1989). Use of the mother tongue in the ESL classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27, 223-235. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp>
- Kikuchi, K. (2006). Revisiting English entrance examinations at Japanese universities after a decade. *JALT Journal*, 28 (1), 77-96. Retrieved from http://jalt-publications.org/jj/issues/2006-05_28.1
- Kikuchi, K. & Browne, C. (2009). English educational policy for high schools in Japan: Ideals vs. reality. *RELC Journal*, 40, 142. doi: 10.1177/0033688209105865
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lee, S. (2008). *Teachers' codeswitching in secondary EFL classrooms in Korea*. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb>
- Lin, A. (2008). Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 2nd Edition, 10: *Research Methods in Language and Education*, 273-286. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_260
- Liu, D., Ahn, G., Baek, K., & Han, N. (2004). South Korean high school English teachers' code switching: Questions and challenges in the driver for maximal use of English teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38 (4), 605-638. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588282>
- Lu, D. (2003). English in Hong Kong. Super highway or road to nowhere? Reflections on policy changes in language education of Hong Kong. *RELC Journal*, 34 (3), 370-384. doi:1177/003368820303400306
- Macaro, E. (1996). Teacher use of the target language (part 1). *Languages Forum*, 11, 52-54.
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85 (4), 531-548. doi:10.1111/
- McDonald, C. (1993). *Using the target language*. Cheltenham, England: Mary Glasgow.
- Meij, H.V.D., & Zhao, X. (2010). Codeswitching in English courses in Chinese universities. *The modern language journal*. 94 (3), 369-411. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb>
- MEXT (2003). 'Action Plan to Cultivate "Japanese with English Abilities"' Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/english/topics/03078201.htm>
- MEXT (2008). Eigokyouiku kaizen jissai jyoukyou kekkagaiyou. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/houdou/20/03/08031920/006.htm
- MEXT (2009). Kouougakkou gakushuu shidou youryou Dai 8 setsugaikokugo. *The New Course of Study*, 87-92. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/_icsFiles/afidfile/2010/01/29/1282000_9.pdf
- Ni, Q. (2007). Traditional Chinese culture and ELT. *SAAL Quarterly*, 80, 2-11. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.co.jp/scholar>
- Morris, P., & Adamson, B. (2010). *The Hong Kong school curriculum*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pennington, M. C. (1995). Pattern and variation in use of two languages in the HongKong secondary English class. *RELC Journal*, 26 (2), 80-105. doi: 10.1177/003368829502600205
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en espanol. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-616. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.co.jp/>

- Qian, X., Tian, G., & Wang, Q. (2009). Codeswitching in the primary EFL classroom in China—Two case studies. *System*, 37, 719-730. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2009.09.015
- Richards, J. C. & Rogers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. & Brownlie, S. (2002). Teacher use of the learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58, 402-426. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.58.3.402
- Skinner, D. (1985). Access to meaning. The anatomy of the language/ learning connection. *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development*, 6, 369-388. doi: 10.1080/01434632.1985.9994212
- Sankoff, D., & Poplack, S. (1981). A formal grammar for code-switching. *Linguistics* 14, 1. 3-46 Retrieved from <http://www.sociolinguistics.uottawa.ca/shanapoplack/pubs/allpubs.html>
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The use of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 251-274. doi: 10.1177/13621688000400304
- Takahashi, T. (1996). *Teachers' L1 Use in the Classroom and Its Influence on the Students*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Aston University, Birmingham, U.K. Retrieved from <http://www.les.aston.ac.uk/lisu/diss/>
- Turnbull, M. (2000). Analysis of core French teachers' language use: A summary. *Proceedings of bilingual child, global citizen colloquium*. Retrieved from www.unb.ca/slec/about/events/content/turnbull.html
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first language in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218 doi: 10.1017/S0267190502000119
- van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. New York: Longman
- Villamil, O., & De Guerrero, M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language writing*, 5, 51-75. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1060374396900156>
- Wells, G. (1999). Using L1 to master L2: A response to Anton and DiCamilla's "Social-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom." *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 248-254. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unud.ac.id/abstrak/2%20agustinus%20semiun%20individual.pdf>
- Xu, Q. (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. Retrieved from <http://www.cscanada.net> [Http://www.cscanada.org](http://www.cscanada.org)
- Yamada, H. & Hristoskova, G. (2011). Teaching and learning English in English in Japanese senior high schools: Teachers' & students' perceptions. *Journal of Fukui-ken Eigo Kenkyu-kai*, 69. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10461/6851>
- Yao, M. (2011). On attitudes to teachers' code-switching in EFL classes. *World Journal of English Language*. doi: 10.5430/wjel.v1n1p19
- Yoshida, K. (2003). Language education policy in Japan: The problem of espousing Objectives versus practice. *The Modern Language Journal*. 87 (2), 290-92.
- Yoshida, K. & Yanase, K. (2003). *Nihongo wo ikashita eigo jyugyou no susume*; Taishuukan.