THE FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING
IN LOWER LEVEL SPANISH LANGUAGE CLASSES[i]

Stacy Anne Reynolds-Case[ii]
Associate Professor,
School of Literature and Languages,
Louisiana Tech University,
USA

Abstract:
Code switching (CS) between Spanish and English is a prevailing and growing phenomenon. There has been a rise over the past two decades in the interest of Spanish-English CS, as it relates to the formation of the Hispanic identity and unity in the U.S. However, there has been little research comparing how CS between bilingual English/Spanish speakers in a natural environment differs or is similar to CS used by Spanish language teachers in the classroom. The researcher for the current study collected speech samples from Spanish teachers' pedagogical language in lower level courses, which were later analyzed in order to determine if there were similarities in the reasons instructors initiate CS in their pedagogical language and the reasons previous studies have shown speakers to use CS outside the classroom. The data reveals that while the speech environment and dynamics between listener and speaker are different, Spanish language teachers and speakers outside the language classroom implement CS for similar reasons.

Keywords: bilingual speech communities; code switching; foreign language education; native language; non-native language; pedagogical discourse; target language

Resumen:
La alternancia de códigos (AI) entre el español y el inglés es un fenómeno prevaleciente que está creciendo en los ambientes de contacto entre las dos lenguas. En las últimas dos décadas, ha habido un aumento en el interés en la AI entre el español y el inglés, al igual que en esta relación con una identidad hispana en los EEUU. Poca investigación se ha hecho, sin embargo, que compara cómo difiere o se asemeja la AI entre hablantes bilingües del español e inglés a la AI que implementan los instructores de español en sus

---

aulas. La autora de este estudio recopiló muestras de habla del lenguaje pedagógico de clases de niveles bajos y las analiza para determinar si las razones por las que los instructores inician la AI en su lenguaje pedagógico son similares al uso de la AI fuera del aula. Los datos muestran que mientras los ambientes de habla y la dinámica entre oyente y hablante son diferentes, los instructores de español y los hablantes fuera del aula utilizan AI por razones similares.

Palabras claves: comunidades de habla bilingües, alternancia de códigos, educación de lenguas extranjeras, lengua nativa, lengua no-nativa, discurso pedagógico, lengua destino

1. Introduction

Code switching (CS) between Spanish and English is a phenomenon that is prevalent in many communities where these two languages are in contact and has become a delicate topic due to the influx of Hispanic immigrants to the U.S. in both metropolitan and rural areas. It has been subject to numerous studies examining both the sociolinguistic factors triggering CS as well as the purely linguistic features, identifying where in utterances CS is most likely to occur (e.g., Auer, 2005; Gumperz, 1964, 1967, 1970, 1976; Hasselmo, 1970; Lipski, 1978; Pfaff 1976; Poplack & Meechen, 1998, 1980; Riehl, 2005; Shaffer, 1978). Additionally, there have been various studies on how CS is used in language classrooms, specifically by language teachers using both the target language (TL) and the students' native language, or as will be referred to in this study, the students' first language (L1) (e.g., Flyman-Mattsson & Burenhult, 1999; Horasan, 2014; Lin, 2013; Macaro, 2005; Moeller & Roberts, 2013; Pollard, 2002). However, there have been few comparative studies on the differences and/or similarities between CS used by teachers in Spanish language classrooms and speakers outside of the classroom. The present study aids in filling this void by demonstrating the CS students may hear their teachers use share similar functions and structures as the CS they might hear outside the classroom.

Today there is little debate that CS does consist of patterns and rules taken from the languages involved, which can be applied to an infinite number of utterances and thus constitute a grammar of its own, and for the purposes of this study, the term CS fits the definition of what the researcher gleaned from data. CS in the classroom has been a charged topic for some scholars and educators. The debate surrounding how much the TL should be spoken in the classroom revolves around CS being used as a crutch or a detriment to language teaching, however when closely analyzing the environment around classroom CS, one might argue it is similar to what occurs between speakers outside the classroom. If the objective of language teachers is to equip students to be able to converse outside the classroom, CS should be taken advantage of and less stigmatized by educators.

Although the environments of a speech community where speakers share two of the same languages and an academic classroom provide for divergent situations, they

both provide natural places for CS to occur. In the bilingual speech community[iii] speakers have two distinct languages at their disposal and can freely switch between the languages. Language classrooms with instructors who are fluent in the students' L1 also provide the instructor with two languages in direct contact: the TL they are striving to teach and the students' L1. In her study, Belz (2003) suggests taking advantage of the multi-lingual environment the language classroom creates to better identify with students and their learning experience. Furthermore, in beginning and intermediate level foreign language courses, it is typically the instructor's principal objective to expose the students to a language in which they are not fluent. In order to do this, it would be necessary to incorporate the TL into the teaching and everyday language of the classroom. In the United States, because many Spanish as a foreign language teachers share the same L1 as their students, there is the comfort of being able to fall back on English for more comprehensive explanations (Coste, Moore, & Zarate, 1997).

2. Previous Literature

2.1 Defining Code Switching
Code switching has been studied and analyzed from different perspectives resulting in various ways to break down and label the phenomenon. Code-mixing is a term some scholars have used interchangeably with CS (Ayeymoni 2006). Translanguaging, on the other hand, is a more complex understanding of how two languages have meshed and essentially become one grammar to the speaker rather than two separate codes. García and Wei (2014) explain translanguaging as,

> "(the) speakers' construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another traditional definition of a language, but that make up the speakers' complete language repertoire" (p. 22).

Similarly, Auer (1984) uses the term language alternation as the use of two languages at a speaker's disposal. Additionally, Auer (1984) describes CS from a monolingual perspective taking on its own grammar and syntax rather than a mixture of two separate languages. Casielles-Suárez (2013) has recently distinguished between sustained CS, where switching occurs at the sentence level, and radical hybridism, an intertwining of two languages characterized by switches within the same sentence. This is similar to traditional studies by Poplack who divided CS into intrasentential switches and emblematic switches, the latter being a code switch within the same sentence or utterance, and the former occurring when an entire sentence or utterance is in one language followed by another complete sentence or utterance in a second language. Emblematic switches could also be an insertion of a tag question or discourse marker. To the average person, CS between Spanish and English refers to the term which was coined

---

[iii] *Bilingual speech community* is used to refer to speech environments where the speakers can mutually understand and speak the same two distinct languages.

as Spanglish. Spanglish, however, is a hybrid language which can result in words created from part of a Spanish word and part of an English word.

2.2 Code Switching Observed in Different Speech Environments

There are has been a plethora of studies on CS in the language classroom (e.g., Belz, 2003; Chavez, 2003; García, Johnson, &, Seltzer, 2017; Macaro, 2005; Turnbull, 2001) as well as the between speakers in natural speech environments (e.g., Al-Khatib, 2003; Toribio, 2002; Rielh, 2005; Zentella, 1997). Some scholars claim CS is a resource that speakers use to identify themselves as part of a Spanish/English bilingual community (e.g., Auer, 2005; Franco-Rodriguez, 2011; Lipski, 2008; Stavans, 2003). Bilingualism can be defined differently depending on the context, purpose, and proficiency of the speaker. For the purposes of this study, bilingualism will be the ability to use two distinct languages to communicate in a clear, comprehensible manner. Students in beginning and intermediate level grammar courses not intended for heritage speakers would not be considered bilingual, because they have not reached a level of clear communication in the TL. In her study, Heller (1988b) demonstrates how bilinguals use CS not only to interact in different tongues, but to actually identify themselves as two or more distinct actors in a dialogue or conversation. In the current study, the data will reveal possible attempts by language teachers to also identify themselves with their students through their choice of language.

Researchers have pointed out that while CS is a prominent feature of some speech communities, it is viewed as a negative phenomenon, producing a less prestigious form of either one of the two languages spoken (e.g., Crystal, 1987; Hildago 1986). Among scholars who have studied CS and the motivations behind its use, studies have shown that speakers may incorporate CS into their speech due to an inability or deficiency in their individual grammars in one or both of the languages spoken (e.g., Crystal, 1987; Polack, 1980). The negativity CS faces by some speakers in bilingual speech communities in the U.S. can also be a source of contention among language educators. Educators are encouraged to conduct their classes almost completely in the TL, including performing more administrative tasks such as collecting assignments and giving directions. This is echoed by Crouse (2012) with his statement:

> *"The pivotal role of target-language interaction in language learning is emphasized in the K–16 Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century. ACTFL therefore recommends that language educators and their students use the target language as exclusively as possible (90% plus) at all levels of instruction during instructional time and, when feasible, beyond the classroom."* (p. 24)

The belief that language instructors teaching more commonly spoken languages such as English, Spanish, or French should deter from using CS in the classroom, making use exclusively of the TL, is not a new concept. As stated in a 1910 English language textbook, *"it is assumed throughout that the teacher…uses the language of his audience as little as possible, his success being judged by the rarity of his lapses into the foreign tongue"* (Thorley, 1919: p. vii). Even into the twentieth and twenty first centuries, little has changed in the

overall perception that language educators must refrain from speaking the students' L1 as much as possible. This is mentioned by Cook,

> "*As a rule, at the beginning of the twenty first century, language teaching classrooms are still supposed to emphasize the spoken language, to avoid the first language and grammatical explanation and to practice language in whole dialogues rather than in isolated fragments—however different actual classroom practice may be.*" (2002, p. 329)

Studies which have encouraged teachers to use the TL exclusively possibly were due to the mindset that CS would not reflect what students would encounter outside the classroom. However, as the current study reveals, the CS used by Spanish language teachers may in fact be a reflection of the structure of CS used in natural speech environments.

The exact point in utterances when a speaker chooses to switch between languages has been the focus of various scholars' research (e.g., Kootstra, Van Hell, & Dijkstra, 2011; MacSwan, 2000; Myers-Scotton, 2002; Poplack, 1980). The topic or theme of a conversation has shown to be a reason to implement CS among bilingual speakers (e.g., Holmes, 2000; Kim, 2006; Silva Corvalán, 2001). Speakers initiate dialogue about a topic and once there is a topic change in the conversation, they easily switch to a second language both the listener and speaker understand, possibly switching back if they revisit the original topic. Additionally, scholars have determined CS among bilinguals as a result of a spontaneous expression of emotion during conversations including showing happiness, sadness, anger, fear, etc. (e.g., Al-Khatib, 2003; Holmes, 2000). A third reason studies have shown speakers to implement CS in their discourse is by repeating the same word or phrase from one language to another (e.g., Kootstra, Van Hell, & Dijkstra, 2011; Nguyen, 2014; Gumperz, 1982). Finally, studies have revealed a word or phrase during dialogues could trigger a speaker to implement CS (e.g., Clyne, 1991; Poplock & Meechan, 1998; Riehl, 2005). The trigger word or phrase might be due to the lack of a concise or appropriate translation in the other language. The data from the current study will show the CS teachers use in Spanish language classes reflect the same or similar reasons.

While educators might strive to speak the TL whenever possible, they find themselves reverting back to the students' native language for a better explanation of specific features, which they might find more difficult to teach using only the TL (e.g., Fennema-Bloom, 2009; Hughes, Shaunessy, Brice, Ratliff, & McHatton, 2006). Scholars have revealed other benefits of using the L1 in the classroom including clarity during administrative tasks, expressing empathy towards students, responding to the students' use of the L1, and translation of unknown vocabulary items (Polio & Duff 1994). In her article, Edstrom (2009) suggested there are times in the foreign language classroom when instructors may even be unaware of lapses into the L1 during instruction. And in their volume, Turnbull and Dailey-O'Cain (2009) explore both pedagogical reasoning as well as socio-linguistic explanations for using the L1 in the language classroom. Gulzar (2010) suggests a primary reason teachers use the students' L1 is to ensure they understand the material with which they are presented.

Although some studies have shown CS to threaten the prestige of the languages speakers in bilingual speech communities use, it does have its advantages in both bilingual communities and the language classroom. Recognizing CS is a staple in both the grammar of the bilingual speaker and the teaching language of the Spanish as a foreign language teacher, the present study addresses the following research questions:

1) What are the differences and/or similarities between the CS bilingual speakers use outside the classroom and language teachers use in the classroom?
2) What are the differences and/or similarities for the reasons behind the CS used by speakers outside the classroom and language teachers in the classroom?
3) What implications would the similarities and/or differences between the CS used by bilinguals and the CS instructors use hold for Spanish language teachers?

3. Methodology

The following sections explain the classes, participant body, and data collection method used in this study.

3.1 Classes
To obtain the data for this study, the author observed multiple classes over the course of a semester or quarter taught by six different Spanish instructors.[iv] Each of the classes chosen for observation met the following criteria: 1) it was conducted in a public university, 2) it was part of the curriculum for Spanish majors/minors as well as a general requirement for liberal arts majors needing 9-12 hours of an L2, 3) it was at an intermediate, second year level (ex. 201, 202) not intended for heritage speakers, and 4) the non-native speaking (NNS) instructors and students were native-speakers (NS) of American English. The classroom topics varied in theme and included grammar and vocabulary lessons, discussions of homework, material reviews and questions, and unstructured conversation. All the classes were predominately teacher-centered, although there were also times in each of the classes when students completed exercises both individually and in small groups.

3.2 Participants
There were six participating instructors; three NS of Spanish and three NNS of Spanish. The NS came from Spain, Nicaragua, and Mexico; the NNS were from different regions in the U.S.

[iv] Four of the instructors taught at a university on the semester system lasting 16 weeks, while two instructors were on the quarter system, each 10 weeks long.

Table 1: Participating Instructors

Name[v]	NS/NNS Status	Years studied L2[vi] in school or university	Formal teacher training[vii]	Yrs. of teaching Spanish in the U.S.	Yrs. living in the U.S.
Sam	NS	12	Yes	8	10
Ana	NS	14	Yes	7	11.5
Jon	NS	11	No	6.5	11
Sara	NNS	9	Yes	5	NA
Ben	NNS	10	Yes	6	NA
Ron	NNS	12	No	4.5	NA

As indicated in Table 1, at the time of the study, all the instructors had been teaching Spanish at least four years in the U.S. The NS instructors had all lived in the U.S. at least 10 years and all the participants were fluent in both English and Spanish.[viii] Two of the NS teachers and two of the NNS teachers had formal training in second and foreign language pedagogy, while one NS and one NNS had no formal education in the teaching of languages. The amount of time each instructor had studied his/her L2 is similar. Additionally, each participant had been teaching the TL for a comparable timeframe.

Approximately four hours were transcribed from each of the participants' classes, totaling 24 hours. The four hours came from four different complete class periods over the course of a semester or quarter and were selected because the researcher was informed by the individual instructors that on those particular days it would be a predominately a teacher-centered class versus students performing in groups, taking a test, or doing individual assignments. This would allow the researcher to gain an optimal amount of the teachers' discourse so as to be capable of making clear observations. The objective of the study was to record and collect raw data from the classes, transcribe the collected data, and finally analyze the transcriptions in order to gain an accurate view of why and how instructors used CS in their classes. As with many studies on discourse, there were uncontrollable variables in this study such as the dynamic in the classroom between the individual instructors and students, the attitude and motivations of the students to learn the language, and the response of students towards an instructor's style and/or teaching methodology. Although these variables could have affected the students' motivation and progress in the classes, the CS the instructors demonstrated in the classes was sufficient enough to contribute to the outcome of the current study.

3.3 Code Switching Observed and Analyzed
From the data collected, the author highlighted the times each instructor switched from either English to Spanish or Spanish to English intrasententially or emblematically. If the

---

[v] Names have been changed for privacy purposes

[vi] The L2 for the first three participants is English and for the last three, Spanish.

[vii] Formal training refers to either obtaining a masters or having taken course work in a program for teachers of second and foreign languages.

[viii] Although there were no formal proficiency assessments given to the participants, after extensive conversations and observations the author determined that all the participants were highly proficient in both languages.

instructor had more than a five second pause between sentences or if a student spoke in between his/her sentence, it was not considered CS.

When analyzing the CS from each class, there were both intrasentential and emblematic switches as Poplack (1980) identified as also surfacing in bilingual speech communities. It was interesting to note that while the NS teachers used CS emblematically and intrasententially, not favoring one type more than the other, the CS of the NNS instructors was almost always emblematic in nature. There could be various reasons for this. The NS teachers could feel more comfortable speaking the language they have a better proficiency in, while at the same time realizing a need to connect with the students in their L1. Therefore, it was easier for them to more freely switch between Spanish and English within the same sentence. The NNS teachers, on the other hand, may not be as inclined to speak Spanish (especially at lower levels of proficiency), noting that students understand them better when speaking in the shared L1, English. Their switching could be more conscious, reflected by the fact that they are whole sentences or repeated phrases instead of switching within the same sentence.

The CS observed in the classrooms occurred at all points in the classes, including introducing and reviewing new material, going over the previous class's lesson, reviewing activities, beginning and closing a class, etc. Based on where the majority of the CS occurred within the instructors' sentences, the researcher divided the CS into four categories or reasons for CS: changes in topic, emotional expression, repetition, and a trigger word or phrase which the speaker preferred to say in either Spanish or English, prompting him/her to switch from the language previously used. These are four categories that have also been identified as reasons CS occurs among bilinguals (Holmes, 2000, Gumperz, 1982; Riehl, 2005). Below is a table indicating the total number of code-switches that were recorded in each of the participant's classes and how they were divided into the above categories.

Table 2: Code-switches from each participant's classes

Name	Total number of CS	Topic Change	Affection	Repetition	Trigger Word	Other
Sam	68	13	8	36	7	4
Ana	72	19	6	40	5	2
Jon	79	18	7	42	6	6
Sara	61	15	9	32	1	4
Ben	45	19	2	21	0	3
Ron	54	13	5	28	3	5

As Table 2 indicates, the instructors were fairly equal in the amount of times they used CS in their classes. The NSs did use more CS than the NNSs. The majority of the switches between all instructors fell under the repetition category, while trigger word switches held the least amount. Below the author gives specific examples to demonstrate each of these categories.

4. Results

4.1 Topic Change

A change in topic can occur at various points within a class. For example, an instructor can switch between grammar lessons, from a vocabulary demonstration to a textbook reading, from the opening/greeting of the class to initiating a quiz or exam, etc. Below are examples of when participating instructors chose to use CS marking a change in topic[ix].

1) **T:** So this is the (class) plan, you see, it's a shorter one. I make it a little bit shorter. So, ***bueno, vamos a hablar entonces de dos nuevos tiempos verbales.*** [So, good, we are going to talk about two new verb tenses.]

2) **T:** We also need to look at what you all need to study for the exam, um, on Thursday. So we'll talk about that towards the end of class. ***Entonces, el perfecto de subjuntivo. ¿Cómo se forma?*** [So, the perfect subjunctive. How is it formed?]

3) **T:** *Bien, aquí tienes el objeto indirecto para él, pero necesitas el verbo en tercera persona plural. Molestan los insectos. ¿Sí? ¿Por qué? ¿Alguien sabe por qué?* **Oh, and I know that's an unfortunate cognate.** *Molestan* **doesn't mean to molest. It's to bother or be bothered, ok? There's other cognates that are like this.** [Good, here you have the indirect object for he, but you need the verb in third person plural. Bothered by the insects. Why? Does someone know why?]

4) **T:** *Este verbo a veces, depende del hablante también ponen a veces el presente. Bueno. ¿Preguntas?* **Then let's go ahead and start the, uh, the exercises on the handout I gave you.** [This verb sometimes, depends on the speaker also puts it sometimes in the present. Good. Questions?]

5) **T:** *Entonces sí, en algunos países de, de eh, Centroamérica se puede ver paisajes muy muy diferentes. Montañas, playas, bosques lluviosos, volcanes. ¿Sí? Ok,* **then we'll stop here and pick up on, uh, another new verbal form on Wednesday. Ok?** [So, yes, in some countries from, from uh, Central America, you can see very very different landscapes. Mountains, beaches, rain forests, volcanos. Alright?]

In Example 1, the instructor speaks English to talk about his plan or objectives for that day's lesson. He switched to Spanish when he initiated the grammar instruction on verbal tenses. It is also noteworthy that he switched between the English discourse marker "so" and the start of his statement in Spanish. The case of a switch happening between a trigger word, or in this case the discourse marker "so", will be discussed in a later section. In Example 2, the instructor talks about the logistics of the class in English and switches to Spanish when teaching the material. Examples 1 and 2 clearly demonstrate a switch in codes from the opening of a class to the start of grammar instruction. In Example 3, the instructor had been speaking in Spanish to go over a sentence on the board requiring the use of a singular indirect object and verb in the plural

---

[ix] The examples given do not occur in succession and may be taken from different class times.
Transcription symbols:
T = instructor
> = interruption
BOLD TYPE = salient feature

form. She changes to English when she shifts topics to explain how the verb *molestar* is a false cognate for English speakers. And in Example 4, the instructor is giving a grammar explanation of sentences he had written on the board and then switches to instruct the students to begin a handout he had previously given them. The handout contained exercises with the vocabulary from the chapter, a different topic than verbs the instructor had just been referencing. The switch takes place from teaching the grammar for the sentences he had written on the board to giving a command for the students to perform something they had previously gone over. Example 5 demonstrates a switch that occurred between talking about the landscapes in Central America in Spanish to the instructor closing the class in English. Examples 1-5 demonstrate occasions in the classroom where instructors switched languages in order to shift topics or frames in the class.

4.2 Emotional Expressions

In the language classrooms observed for the current study, there were times the instructors switched languages to express how they were feeling. Emotional expressions can occur at different points in a speaker's discourse such as spontaneous tags or fillers and can express varying emotions such as approval, sympathy, praise, disappointment, and frustration. At times it seems the instructors are trying to connect with students on a more personal level, and therefore are prompted to switch from Spanish to the students' L1, English. Other times, the switch appears to represent a completely spontaneous reaction in which the instructor chose to switch to the language that was more natural or comfortable for him/her whether that be his/her L1 or the TL in the class. The following examples found from the data illustrated emotional switches where there was a switch into English in order to truly convey his/her feelings, whether frustration or praise for the students.

1) **T: It helps, guys, if you do this before, okay?** *Insisto, insisto, ¿qué significa (insisto)? Hmmm, siguiente, alguien,* **anybody, surprise me.** ['I insist, I insist', what does that mean? Hmmm, next, anyone, anybody, surprise me.]

2) **T:** *¿Lo lograste? Muy bien,* **congratulations.** [You did it? Very good, congratulations.]

3) **T:** *Número cinco,* **our friend, you plural informal. That one that gives you all those headaches.** [Number five…]

4) **T:** *La película es muy bonita[x], toma tanto tiempo,* **I'm sorry. I would love to to have time to watch movies and stuff** *pero>* [The movie is very nice, it takes too much time…]

In Example 6, the instructor was going over homework the students should have done, but many had not. He seemed to be frustrated, and used the students' L1 to express this. Example 7 reveals a time in the class when the instructor praised a student who had just made a discovery about a grammatical feature in Spanish. She used Spanish at first, but then switched to English when recognizing a student's accomplishment. Example 8

---

[x] Referring to the painter, Frida Kahlo, and the movie *Frida.*

shows the instructor's sympathy towards the students. He knew the *vosotros* (second person plural) form of verbs is difficult for students, and he chose to express his sympathy in English. In the last example, the instructor was apologetic that they are unable to view a movie in class, and by switching to English, she expressed that she really would like to show the movie, but due to time it would be impossible. The phrase "I would love to…" could also be a phrase which is easier to say in English than Spanish, and the instructor chose that route due to the ease in which she could express her feelings. The instructors' emotional reactions and feelings expressed towards their students appear to be a conscious decision to implement CS and could denote times when the instructors wanted to connect with students through their L1.

4.3 Repetition

Repetition is common in second and foreign language classrooms. Chaudron (1988) describes repetition as a strategy instructors use to reinforce the learning of the language in question. It is assumed the more a student hears a certain feature of the language, the better chance s/he will have of remembering it. Many instructors also use repetition as a means to verify a student's correct answer. The reason for doing this could be in order to praise the student, confirm that other students heard the answer, or to reinforce the answer, helping students to remember it (Eldridge, 1996; Sert, 2005). In the present corpus, the majority of the times CS was used for repetition was from Spanish to English, suggesting the teachers' desire for student comprehension.

1) **T:** *¿Cómo se dice **lo contrario de "encontrar?"** **The opposite of "encontrar"?** [How do you say the opposite of "to find"?]
2) **T:** *Hace muchos años, ¿qué significa esto? ¿Hace muchos años?* **What does that mean?** [A long time ago. What does this mean? A long time ago?]
3) **T:** *Bueno, recordáis que éste **es muy fácil.** **It's very easy.** [Good, remember that this is very easy.]
4) **T:** They discover *la historia al **mismo tiempo.*** **Same time.** [They discover the story at the same time.]
5) **T:** *Vamos a ver el análisis. Análisis literario **de un cuento.*** **Of a story.** [We are going to see analysis. Literary analysis of a story.]
6) **T:** *Sufra* sounds **more better to me.** *Suena mejor.* [Suffer sound more better to me. It sounds better.]

In Example 10, the instructor repeated the part of the question which was the most important for the students to understand, and therefore increased the possibility for them to give a correct answer. Similarly, in Example 11, the instructor elicited a response from students, and the repeated phrase in English shifted the dialogue to the students. In Example 12, the instructor could be seeking to make the students feel confident about the material he was presenting to them. It is probable that the students could understand when the instructor said in Spanish that "it is very easy," but by repeating it in English, he reassured the students that the material in question was indeed easy. This also reinforced the instructor's confidence in the students to be able to perform the material. By building the students' confidence, he appears less as an authority figure, increasing

the solidarity between himself and the students. Examples 13 and 14 demonstrate instances when the instructor felt it necessary to repeat the last part of an utterance either to keep the students' attention or to ensure their understanding of the portion of the utterances not containing cognates. Example 15 reveals an interesting case of CS and one of the few times when there is a repetitive switch from English to Spanish. Although it is not certain, it is possibly due to the realization that the phrase "*more better" was grammatically incorrect, leading the instructor to "correct" herself in the other language.

4.4 Trigger Words/phrases

The final category observed in the present study revealing the similarities between classroom CS and bilingual CS is when there is a switch in language due to a certain trigger word or phrase used by the speaker, influencing his/her decision to change languages. This could be a tag phrase, discourse marker, or idiom that does not have a translation in one language suitable to the speaker. Additionally, it could simply be one language's translation of certain words or phrases is more concise than another. Below are examples in the data where the researcher noticed a word or phrase triggered a switch in languages among the instructors observed.

1) **T:** So, *es **presente de indicativo** pero ahora haya visto*, as you already know, *se llama **pretérito perfecto de subjuntivo**. ¿Por qué?* Because it's probable that somebody has seen somebody in the past. Okay? This is the present, but it's talking referring to something that happened *en el pasado*. When that happens, you need to use ***pretérito perfecto de subjuntivo***. It's possible that you passed that biology class two years ago. You use the ***pretérito perfecto***. [So, it's present indicative but now you have seen, as you already know, it's called subjunctive preterit perfect. Why? Because it's probable that somebody in the past. Okay? This is present, but it's talking referring to something that happened in the past. When that happens you need to use subjunctive preterit perfect. It's possible that you passed that biology class two years ago. You use the preterit perfect.]

2) **T:** The verb here in the beginning *es **el indicativo**, ¿verdad? **El subjuntivo*** would be '*use*.' What if you say if you said '*usa*' instead of '*use*'? [...it is the indicative, right? The subjunctive would be 'use.']

3) **T:** We're gonna learn *expresar cosas en **pasado subjuntivo***. So there's an exercise. [We're gonna learn to express things in the subjunctive past.]

4) **T:** *El **pretérito perfecto*** can be kinda tricky, but that's the way it is, okay? [The preterit perfect (form) can be kinda tricky...]

5) **T:** This means that you need to review your ***pretéritos de indicativos***. That's one other reason you need to know the things you learn ***en el pasado***, okay, in previous courses. [This means that you need to review your preterit indicatives. That's one other reason you need to know the things you learn in the past (courses), okay, in previous courses.]

6) **T:** *Y así es como deben conjugar el verbo.* **So**, *vamos a empezar con el ejercicio del libro.* [And that is how you all should use the verb. So, we are going to start with the exercise from the book.]

7) **T:** *Número dos. ¿Quién es* Jason King **by the way? I have no clue.** [Number two. Who is Jason King, by the way?]

The first 5 examples above were taken from the same instructor who chose to use Spanish when naming verbal tenses, especially when they contain more than one word, such as "*pretérito perfecto de subjuntivo* [subjunctive preterit perfect]." In Example 16, he uses the English words "past" and "present," which are smaller, less complex terms. Interestingly, even when the entire proceeding and following utterances are in English, the instructor switches to Spanish with the verbal tense names, as seen in the majority of the examples given. The instructor could be using Spanish for names of verbal forms as a pedagogical tool allowing students to be exposed to them in the TL and also to maintain consistency in the classroom for his references to verbal tenses. Example 20, however, may contradict the idea of using CS as a means to teach the names of verbal forms in the TL. In this example the instructor uses the word "*pasado*" to refer to the time period and not when talking about the verbal tense. This could be an automatic response the instructor uses regardless of whether he is talking about the verbal form or the time period to which it refers. Based on the consistency with his choice to switch to Spanish to say the verbal tenses, it demonstrates that verbal tense names initiate CS for him.

Example 21, similar to an example from an above set, demonstrates one instructor's choice to switch to English with the discourse marker, "so". This could be because it is a more concise discourse marker than the Spanish translation, "*entonces*," or it simply reflects the instructor's preference and one she uses on a regular basis. The final example contains a more laid back almost social instance where the CS is used at the start of a specific phrase. Example 22 contains the colloquial phrase, "by the way," which is from a more informal vernacular and is commonly heard between two people in casual conversation. It would not translate with the same words in Spanish, and the instructor may have realized this when implementing CS.

5. Conclusions and Implications

Code switching is a consistent feature in both language classrooms and among speakers in bilingual speech environments. With the data presented here, one can see some of the reasons CS occurs in bilingual communities also surfaces in the CS Spanish language teachers use in their classrooms. These reasons include changing topics, showing emotion, repeating oneself, and after a trigger word or phrase. This adds to the literature that CS does serve a pedagogical purpose in the language classroom, and therefore should be viewed as a tool rather than a crutch (Fennema-Bloom, 2009; Macaro, 2005; Sert, 2005; Turnbull, 2005).

A significant difference in the CS inside and outside language classrooms is the make-up of the speaker/listener dynamic. When CS is used among speakers outside the classroom, both participants are knowledgeable in both languages. They also could be seeking to form a unified cultural identity and solidify their relationship through the two languages. The teacher/student language background is quite different. While the speaker (when referring to the teacher) may be bilingual in the TL and the students' L1,

the students in lower level language courses are far from the same level in the TL, which can lead one to determine that the reasons for CS is not determined by the language abilities of both the listener and speaker. The similarities between Spanish instructors' use of CS and the CS bilinguals use outside the classroom, however, are demonstrated with the reasons behind their choice to switch languages.

This study does have limitations in the low amount of data collected. Furthermore, it the results can be strengthened by observing and analyzing the participating instructors' spontaneous language outside of the classroom to then compare it with their teaching language. Are there examples of CS that are similar in both environments? Also, it would be interesting to analyze other language classes in different settings. Would the results be the same, for example, in a French class taught in Germany or English class taught in China? Additionally, would there be a difference in a Spanish class for heritage speakers? Collecting more data and confirming the results with other Spanish grammar classes would also strengthen the argument that the CS heard by Spanish language teachers in the classroom is not all that different from the CS used outside the classroom.

The present study contributes to foreign language education by showing that the reasoning behind a commonly occurring phenomenon in language classrooms is similar to the CS used outside the classroom. Spanish teachers with English speaking students who choose to implement CS between English and Spanish as a pedagogical tool can feel more confident with their choice. The fact that the reasons instructors choose to use CS inside the classroom overlap with the reasons speakers use CS outside the classroom demonstrates the authenticity of the teaching language.

About the Author

Dr. Stacy Anne Reynolds-Case is an Associate Professor of Spanish at Louisiana Tech University in Ruston, Louisiana where she currently teaches all levels of Spanish language, linguistics, and culture. She is also the director of the Tech—Costa Rica study abroad program. Her research focuses on methods of teaching second and foreign languages, second language acquisition, and Spanish language variation as it applies to Spanish pedagogy. Dr. Reynolds-Case received her MA in Teaching Second Languages from the University of Southern Mississippi and her Ph.D. in Linguistics from Louisiana State University. She has published numerous articles in a variety of journals including Hispania, Foreign Language Annals, and the *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a la Enseñanza de Lenguas*.

References

Al-Khatib, H. (2003). Language alteration among Arabic and English youth bilinguals: Reflecting or construction social realities? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 6/6,* 409-422.

Auer, P. (2005). A postscript: Code-switching and social identity. *Journal of Pragmatics, 37:* 403-410.

--- (1984). *Bilingual conversation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ayeomoni, M. O. (2006). Code-switching and code-mixing: Style of language use in childhood in Yoruba speech community. *Nordic Journal of African Studies, 15/1:* 90-99.

Belz, J. A. (2003). Identity, deficiency, and first language use in foreign language education. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign-language classrooms,* (pp. 209-248). Boston: Heinle.

Breen, M & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics 1/2,* 89-112.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* New York: Pearson Education Company.

Casielles-Suárez, E. (2013). Radical code-switching in The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, 90*: 475-487.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. (2002). Language teaching methodology and the L2 user perspective. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Portraits of the L2 user; Second language acquisition*, (pp. 327-343). Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Coste, D., Moore, D., & Zarate, G. (1997). *Compétence plurilingue et pluriculturelle.* Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.

Crouse, D. (2012). Going for 90% plus: How to stay in the target language. *The Language Educator, 1/4:* 22-27.

Crystal, D. (1987). The Cambridge encyclopedia of language. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Edstrom, A. (2009). Teacher reflection as a strategy for evaluating L1/L2 use in the classroom. *Babylonia, 1/09:* 12-15.

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal, 50/4*: 303-311.

Fennema-Bloom, J. (2009). Code-scaffolding: A pedagogic code-switching technique for bilingual content instruction. *Journal of Education, 190(3):* 27-35.

Flyman-Mattsson, A. & Burenhult, N. (1999). Code Switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers*, 47: 59-72. Department of Linguistics, Lund University.

Franco-Rodriguez, J. (2011). Linguistic landscape and linguistic maintenance: The case of Los Angele and Miami-Dade counties. In M. Morris (Ed.), *Culture and language: Multidisciplinary case studies,* (pp. 69-119). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

García, O., Johnson, S., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom*. Philadelphia: Caslon.

Genishi, C. (1976). Rules for code-switching in young Spanish-English speakers: An exploratory study of language socialization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkley.

Gulzar, M. (2010). Code-switching: Awareness about its utility in bilingual classrooms. *Bulletin of Education and Research, 32/2*: 23-44.

Gumperz, J. J. (1964). Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. *American Anthropologist, 66(6), part 2:* 137-154.

--- (1967). On the linguistic markers of bilingual communication. *Journal of Social Issues, 23:* 48-57.

--- (1970). Verbal strategies in multilingual communication. *Georgetown Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, 23:* 129-148.

--- (1976). The sociolinguist significance of conversational code-switching. *Working Paper 46.* University of California, Berkley, Language Behavior Research Laboratory.

Hasselmo, N. (1970). Code-switching and modes of speaking. In G.G. Gilbert (Ed.), *Texas studies in bilingualism,* (pp. 179-210). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Heller, M. (1988b). Strategic ambiguity: Code-switching in the management of conflict. In M. Heller (Ed.). *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*, (pp. 77-96). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hildago, M. (1986). Language contact, language loyalty, and language prejudice on the Mexican border. *Language in Society, 15/2*: 193-219.

Holmes, J. (2000). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Wellington: Longman.

Horasan, S. (2014). Code-switching in EFL classrooms and the perceptions of the students and teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies,10/1*: 31-45.

Hughes, C. Shaunessy, E., Brice, A. Ratliff, M. A., & Alvarez-McHatton, P. (2006). Code switching among bilingual and limited English proficient students: Possible indicators of giftedness. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 30:* 7-28.

Kim, E. (2006). Reasons and motivations for code-mixing and code-switching. *Issues in EFL, 4/1:* 43-59.

Kootstra, G., Van Hell, J., & T. Dijkstra. (2011). Priming of code-switches in sentences: The role of lexical repetition, cognates, and language proficiency. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 15/4:* 797-819.

Lin, A. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review, 4/1*: 195-218.

Lipski, J. M. (1978). Code-switching and the problem of bilingual competence. In M. Paradis (Ed.), *Aspects of bilingualism,* (pp. 250-264). Columbia, S.C.: Hornbeam Press.

--- (2008). *Varieties of Spanish in the United States.* Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Lynch, T. (1996). *Communication in the language classroom.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: a communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*, (pp. 63-84). Berlin: Springer.

MacSwan, J. (2000). The architecture of bilingual faculty: Evidence from intrasentential code switching. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 3:* 37-54.

Maybin, J. (2001). Language struggle and voice: The Bakhtin/Volosinov writings. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice,* (pp. 64-71). London: Sage.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moeller, A. & Roberts, A. (2013). Keeping it in the target language. In S. Dhonau (Ed.), *MultiTasks, multiskills, multiconnections: Selected papers from the 2013 Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages,* (pp. 21-38). Eau Clarie, WI: Crown Prints.

Nguyen, T. (2014). *Code switching: A sociolinguistic perspective.* Hamburg: Anchor Academic Publishing.

Pfaff, C. (1976). *Syntactic constraints on code-switching: A quantitative study of Spanish/English.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America.

Pollard, S. (2002). The benefit of code switching within a bilingual education program. Honors Projects, 1-17. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=hispstu_honproj.

Polio, C., & Duff, P. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal, 78:* 313–326.

Poplack, S. (1977). Quantitative analysis of constraints on code-switching. *Working Papers.* New York: City University of New York, Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños.

--- (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish *y termino en Español*: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics, 18:* 581-618.

Poplack, S. & Meechan, M. (1998). How languages fit together in code-mixing. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 2*: 127-138.

Rayfield, J. R. (1970). *The Languages of a bilingual community.* The Hague: Mouton.

Riehl, C. M. (2005). *Code-switching in bilinguals: Impacts of mental processes and language awareness.* In Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism: (pp. 1945-1959).

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal, 6/8:* Retrieved from: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html.

Shaffer, D. (1978). The place of code-switching in linguistic contacts. In M. Paradis (Ed.), *Aspects of Bilingualism.* Colombia, S.C.: Hornbeam Press.

Silva Corvalán, C. (2001). *Sociolingüística y pragmática del Español.* Georgetown Univ. Press: Washington DC.

Stavans, I. (2003). *Spanglish: The making of a new American language.* New York: Thorley, W.C. (1918) *A Primer of English for Foreign Students.* London: Macmillan.

Toribio, A.J. (2002). Spanish-English code-switching among US Latinos. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 158:* 89-119.

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but. *The Canadian modern language review / La revue canadienne des langues viviantes 57(4)*: 531-540.

Turnbull, M. & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). (Eds.) *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.