

Copyright

by

Lisa Michelle Seidlitz

2003

The Dissertation Committee for Lisa Michelle Seidlitz certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Functions of Codeswitching in Classes of German as a Foreign Language

Committee:

Mark Southern, Supervisor

Zsuzsanna Abrams

Hans Boas

Frank Donahue

Carl Blyth

**Functions of Codeswitching in Classes of German as a Foreign
Language**

by

Lisa Michelle Seidlitz, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May, 2003

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to express my gratitude to Mark Southern and Zsuzsanna Abrams for advising, guiding and encouraging me and for occasionally lighting fires beneath me. I don't know how I would have finished this project without your invaluable assistance. You've both been wonderful mentors to me. I would also like to thank my other committee members, Hans Boas, Carl Blyth and Frank Donahue for their many useful suggestions and for making time in your crowded schedules for exams, presentations and meetings. I also appreciate the guidance I received from Mark Loudon through the early stages of this project as well as in the many inspiring courses I had with him. I owe much gratitude to my friends Jennifer Putterman, Jennifer Roberts, Ivan Eidt, and Lara Ducate, who were great listeners and advisors when work wasn't going well and cheerleaders when it was. Thank you to my family for their love and support throughout the long, long process of graduate school, and to Lena Schwarz-Katzen, Lucia Gattanegra and Charlie Ravioli for their friendship, which made this project more bearable. Finally, thanks to my husband Nick Dobson, whose sense of humor helped keep me sane. Thank you for constantly reassuring me that I could do this.

Functions of Codeswitching in Classes of German as a Foreign Language

Publication No. _____

Lisa Michelle Seidlitz, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2003

Supervisor: Mark Southern

Codeswitching is the alternating use of two or more languages in discourse. The goal of this study was to find order in the apparent chaos of codeswitching in foreign language classes and to find patterns within the seeming random alternation of languages. This study is based on twenty hours of audio- and videotaped data collected in second-year German language classes taught by graduate students at the University of Texas at Austin and compares my data with the typologies created by previous research in language alternation. I first considered Gumperz's model, which considers language use as a function of the dynamics of interactions (Gumperz 1982). Polio and Duff's research similarly studied micro-level functions of codeswitching in interaction; their work focused on interaction within foreign language classes in the U.S. (Polio and Duff 1994). I also considered the types of codeswitching identified by Myers-Scotton's

Markedness Model (Myers-Scotton 1987 & 1988), which consider linguistic variation to be derived from the sociological attributes of the speaker and the situation rather than from the details of specific interactional episodes. Most of the functions and types of codeswitching identified by previous research were also found in the current study; nevertheless, there was variation among teachers. Most significantly, native language seems to be the most significant variable affecting the functional distribution of languages in the classroom among the teachers I studied. The American teachers codeswitched more frequently, especially for the grammar practice, instructions, humor and praise, while Germans used overall much less English. These observed patterns suggest that there is order to the way teachers allocate their languages in the classroom. This systematicity provides support for the notion that foreign language classrooms can be considered emerging speech communities, ones which are perhaps still in the process of determining norms but which do demonstrate patterns.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Situating the study	7
Codeswitching definitions	7
Psycholinguistic approaches to codeswitching	9
Linguistic approaches to codeswitching.....	11
Sociolinguistic approaches to codeswitching.....	15
Studies of codeswitching in bilingual and foreign language classes.....	25
Foreign language classes as emerging multilingual speech communities....	36
Chapter 3: Methods	43
Subjects.....	43
Preparing to observe classes	45
Data collection.....	46
Transcribing the recordings	47
Numeric analysis of transcripts	49
Qualitative analyses of transcripts	57
Chapter 4: Findings	59
Gumperz' typology of codeswitching	60
Situational codeswitching.....	60
Metaphorical codeswitching.....	70
Addressee specification.....	70
Quotation.....	71
Interjections	73
Reiteration	75
Qualification.....	82

Personalization and objectivization.....	85
Summary of Gumperz’s functions of codeswitching	95
Polio and Duff’s classroom functions of CS	96
Administrative vocabulary and classroom managment.....	98
Grammar instruction.....	99
Solidarity	99
English practice by the teacher	100
Translation of unknown target language vocabulary	101
Remedy of lack of student understanding	106
Interactive effects	108
Summary of Polio and Duff’s uses of codeswitching	113
Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model.....	114
Sequential unmarked codeswitching and codeswitching as an unmarked choice.....	114
Codeswitching as a marked choice.....	118
Exploratory codeswitching	126
Summary of Myers-Scotton’s types of CS	131
Chapter 5: Conclusions	133
Summary of Findings	133
Implications	140
Limitations of the current study	142
Directions for future research.....	143
Appendix A: Teacher Survey.....	146
Appendix B: Student Survey.....	153
Appendix C: Transcription conventions.....	160
Bibliography	161
Vita	175

List of Tables

Table 1: Division of each function among languages	61
Table 2: Mean use of English by function.....	62
Table 3: Self-translation in raw numbers and percentages.....	76
Table 4: Means for self-translation for each group of native speakers, based on percentages	77
Table 5: Percentages of interpersonal functions divided among German and English.....	86
Table 6: Mean use of English for interpersonal functions, divided among Germans and Americans	87
Table 7: Division of each function among languages	97
Table 8: Mean use of English by function.....	98
Table 9: Frequency of switching due to interaction effects.....	109
Table 10: Group means for interaction effects	109
Table 11: Division of all teacher talk into languages, by c-unit and by time	119
Table 12: Frequency of flagged switches to English.....	121
Table 13: Group means of flagged codeswitching, based on percentages.....	121

Chapter 1: Introduction

I have long been interested in the ways in which multilinguals make use of the various languages at their disposal. Whenever I hear multilingual colleagues and friends alternate between languages within a single conversation, I wonder what motivated the switch. Did they switch languages because they simply could not think of a word in one language or because one language lacks a concise word for a given notion? Did a word or phrase in one language suit their purposes better because of some emotional association with either the expression or its source language? Are these speakers even aware that they have switched languages? What does this language alternation say about these speakers' perceptions of themselves and their interlocutors?

Furthermore, I noticed that I engaged in codeswitching myself, both in casual conversation and while teaching German language classes. I noticed that I occasionally switched languages deliberately and that sometimes the English seemed to slip out. Occasionally I switched to English consciously in order to explain some point of grammar or define a word, but sometimes I wasn't sure, in retrospect, why I had used English. I also wondered what other teachers did in their own classes. If they used English, how much did they use it and for what purposes? How did speaking multiple languages affect the way these teachers communicated information and related to their students? These are a few of the questions that motivated my desire to study the communicative functions of codeswitching in foreign language classes.

My study seeks to describe patterns of language alternation in classes of German as a foreign language at the University of Texas at Austin. I based my study on audio and videotaped data recorded in second year classes taught by graduate students. After transcribing the language spoken in class, I analyzed it both numerically and descriptively in order to compare what I observed in those classrooms with the patterns of language use studied and identified by other researchers. I assumed that the language alternation that I found would be systematic, not random, and that clearly identifiable functions of codeswitching would emerge. In other words, I expected to be able to infer from the interactional context the teachers' intentions in alternating languages. In this study, I focus on teachers' utterances although I do consider the effect that students' questions and comments and language choices had on their teachers.

Codeswitching is the alternating use of two or more languages in discourse (Poplack 1980). That is, sometimes multilingual speakers make alternating use of all of the languages at their disposal while conversing with other multilinguals. They can switch between or within sentences, and they can switch for many reasons, for example, because they do not know a specific word in one language or the other, or because of differing emotional attachments to their languages. Codeswitching can be approached from a strictly linguistic perspective, seeking to determine where within clauses speakers may switch languages. Psycholinguistic approaches to codeswitching seek to understand how multilinguals store and access their languages during conversations. Sociolinguistic approaches to codeswitching seek to describe why multilinguals

alternate languages in discourse; such approaches describe language choice on both a micro level, looking at specific interactional episodes, and on a macro level, looking at patterns within larger speech communities. Sociolinguistic approaches to codeswitching guide the current study.

Although there have been many sociolinguistic studies of codeswitching, comparatively little has been done on language alternation in foreign language classes in the U.S. Numerous studies have been conducted on language use in bilingual education programs in the U.S. For example, Zentella (1981) described the patterns of language alternation that she observed in bilingual classes in the U.S., and Jacobson (1990) proposed a principled functional distribution of languages in bilingual elementary education. Classroom codeswitching in former colonies has also been studied by such researchers as Merritt et al (1992), who studied Kenyan primary classrooms; Canagarajah (1995) who focuses on Jaffna; Camilleri (1996), who studied Maltese secondary classrooms; and Arthur (1996) who worked in Botswana primary schools. Work done in the specific setting of foreign language classes in the United States is still limited. Polio and Duff (1994) and Duff and Polio (1990) described the amount and functions of students' native language in foreign language instruction at a U.S. university. Some recent studies have also addressed the role of the students' L1 in FL instruction in other countries, for example, Butzkamm (1998), who considered students' use of their native language in German secondary classes; Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002), who worked in Australia; and Macaro (2001), who studied student teachers' codeswitching in Britain. This study aims to help fill the gap in the research by

describing language use in this academic setting, using primarily qualitative methods. The goal of this study is to create some order out of the apparent chaos of codeswitching in classroom interaction and to find patterns of language use by comparing my data to the types of CS identified by previous research. In this study, I describe in detail the communicative functions for which teachers used the German and English languages in their classes of German as a foreign language at the University of Texas at Austin.

I compare my data to the types of codeswitching previously identified by Gumperz (1982a), Polio and Duff (1994), and Myers-Scotton in her Markedness Model (1987, 1988). The first two were chosen because they represent different functional models of CS based on interaction; in other words, they consider the functions of codeswitching within specific interactional episodes. Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model was chosen because this model looks at macro-level CS patterns that are based on general characteristics of speakers and settings. I chose to compare my data to this research because I wanted to study both the way that speakers make language choices dynamically during interaction, and how these choices reflect larger language use patterns. I hoped to find patterns of language use and be able to describe the systematicity of this emerging speech community. By providing evidence of such orderliness, I argue that foreign language classrooms can be considered emerging multilingual speech communities, in which language choice is not arbitrary and in which there are norms and standards for language use.

In this study, I use many terms and abbreviations that I would like to define briefly here. The term *codeswitching* is crucial for this study and refers to the alternating use of two or more languages within discourse. Here, code does not suggest that the language used is difficult to interpret or that it is mysterious; rather, *code* is a neutral word that means language or language variety. I use the terms *codeswitching* and *language alternation* interchangeably, and I occasionally use the acronym CS for *codeswitching*. Throughout this work, I make frequent reference to native and target languages. The native languages for the teachers I studied was either German or American English, while the native language of the majority of the students in the classes studied was American English. The target language, or the language that the students were learning, was German; here, I occasionally use the acronym TL. For the students observed in this study, German was also a foreign language, since they were learning it in the U.S; I occasionally use the abbreviation FL for foreign language. Following the work of many other researchers, I use the abbreviation L1 to refer to native language, and L2 to refer to second language. Other abbreviations that I use include NS and NNS, for native speaker and non-native speaker.

This dissertation is structured as follows. In chapter 2, I situate the study within the field of *codeswitching*, particularly within sociolinguistic approaches to the topic. I also outline prior work in many other areas that influenced my interpretation of the data, including classroom discourse analysis, bilingual education, bilingualism, and communication accommodation theory. Chapter 3 describes the methods of my study: who the subjects were, how I collected and

analyzed my data. In chapter 4, I present my findings. Here I use both numeric and descriptive data to compare my sample to the categories of codeswitching described by the previous research of Gumperz (1982a), Polio and Duff (1994) and Myers-Scotton (1987 and 1988). Through this comparison, I make the case that the systematicity of the results of this and other analyses of classroom codeswitching confirm the notion that foreign language classes can be considered emerging speech communities with norms and standards of their own. In chapter 5, I summarize my conclusions, describe possible implications and limitations of this study and describe directions for future classroom-based codeswitching research.

Chapter 2: Situating the study

CODESWITCHING DEFINITIONS

The phenomenon of codeswitching can be approached from several angles and can be defined in various ways. Poplack (1980), for example, defines codeswitching as the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent. Valdes-Fallis' definition also focuses on the structure of switches as she defines codeswitching as the alternating use of two languages on the word, phrase, clause or sentence level (1978). Auer (1984) in contrast, defines CS as the locally functional use of multiple languages in an interactional episode, which places emphasis on the roles of the different codes. Gumperz (1982) similarly focuses on the functions of codeswitching when he defines CS as a discourse phenomenon that can generate conversational inferences; that is, language choice itself can carry meaning in addition to the content of the message. Muysken's (1987) definition includes the stipulation that the linguistic varieties be perceived by their speakers to be distinct from one another, which suggests that codeswitching is considered significant only when speakers themselves note the differences between the languages involved. In contrast, Alvarez-Cáccamo (1998) suggests a very different definition of CS. He defines a code not as a language variety but as something used to interpret and produce speech. A study of codeswitching under this paradigm would begin with examination of changes in footing or focus and then study the mechanisms used to accomplish such shifts, including changing linguistic varieties as well as other

devices such as speech markers and prosody. this study follows the practice of the majority of researchers, however, and uses code as a neutral term for language or language variety, and codeswitching means simply alternation of languages in discourse.

One may distinguish where within sentences switches occur; Poplack (1980) identifies tag switches, intersentential switches and intrasentential switches. Tag switches, also known as emblematic switches, typically consist of small units that are appended to and not integrated with larger monolingual units in the other language. The tacking on of short expressions such as “right,” and “you know” are considered emblematic because they may identify a speaker a multilingual in an otherwise monolingual utterance. Such brief utterances may be unintentional slips of the tongue since these phrases are produced automatically. Intersentential switches take place at clause boundaries, with each clause fully in one language or another. A single speaker may switch intersententially, or the switch can coincide with a change in speakers, or turn boundaries. Intrasentential switching takes place within clause boundaries and is typically the most frowned-upon type of switching because it is considered to be a sign of laziness or incomplete language competence (cf., for example, Sridhar [1996], Weinreich [1968]). Poplack (1980) suggests, however, that intrasentential CS may actually require the greatest skill and fluency in each language. Romaine (1994) states that intrasentential CS involves the greatest syntactic risk because of the difficulty of integrating two or more linguistic systems. Intrasentential CS is sometimes referred to as codemixing, but this study follows the prevailing terminology as

discussed by such researchers as Romaine (1994), Jacobson (1998), and Pfaff (1997), using the term codeswitching to refer to all types of language alternation, whether inter- or intrasentential. Appel and Muysken (1987) identify three approaches to codeswitching: psycholinguistic, linguistic or grammatical and sociolinguistic, which are each considered in turn below.

PSYCHOLINGUISTIC APPROACHES TO CODESWITCHING

Psycholinguistic approaches to bilingualism examine those aspects of language capacity that enable speakers to alternate languages. For example, one might study the psycholinguistic mechanisms involved in production and reception of multilingual speech; that is, what kinds of abilities are required in order to use and understand two or more languages in succession or simultaneously, or what role does proficiency play in multilingual language processing and production, or are different categories such as content and function words processed differently. (See also Pfaff [1997] for a discussion of the issues in psycholinguistic approaches to CS.) Related to questions of processing are questions of storage and acquisition of multiple languages. Weinreich (1953) identified three possible types of bilinguals. Coordinate bilinguals may be compared to two monolinguals with two separate, parallel systems which have separate lexicons as well as separate sets of concepts to which lexical items are mapped. For example, coordinate bilinguals might have both the English word “book” mapped to a notion of a book, and the German word “Buch” which maps to a separate notion of a German book. Compound bilinguals, on the other hand,

are assumed to have one set of concepts, for example, containing the notion of a book, but with two sets of lexical items and grammatical rules to express that notion, e.g., “book” and “Buch.” For subordinate bilinguals, one language is dominant to the language or languages, and the subordinate languages are processed through and with the help of the dominant language. Determining the organization and storage of multiple languages in the brain is one goal of psycholinguistics.

Grosjean (1985) suggests that a monolingual view of language use has colored much of the study of bi- or multilingualism, which has led to widespread beliefs that “ideal” bilinguals should be the equivalent of two monolinguals. Such a belief in the existence and superiority of ideal bilinguals takes into account neither social factors nor significant psycholinguistic differences in the ways that multilinguals acquire and use the languages in their repertoires. Grosjean (1985) stresses the need for more study from a multilingual perspective. For example, while psycholinguists have looked at how languages are activated one at a time in a multilingual brain, little attention has been paid to the simultaneous activation that is required for codeswitching (470). In addition, more work must be done to describe bilinguals’ mixed competence as distinct from the competence in two separate languages, and studies should focus on language processing when language input and output are monolingual as well as when in- and output are multilingual (472). Finally, Grosjean suggests that multilinguals have a continuum of “speech modes” which ranges from completely monolingual to multilingual. It would therefore be necessary to determine what mode speakers

are in before making any claims about their language processing or competence. That is, if a speaker is in a fully multilingual mode while speaking, one may draw different conclusions about their language competence than if that speaker is in a more monolingual mode. It may be difficult to determine this mode but it would be useful to know whether speakers are aware of what language or languages they are using rather than assuming that they are in a monolingual mode and evaluating them accordingly. To sum up, Grosjean's perspective is that multilingualism and codeswitching should be approached from a multilingual, not monolingual perspective. An approach that assumes that multilingualism is normal and not deviant from monolingualism may yield truer insights into the organization of functioning of the multilingual brain, including the production and processing of codeswitching.

LINGUISTIC APPROACHES TO CODESWITCHING

Linguistic approaches to codeswitching seek to identify grammatical rules for language alternation—that is, the morphosyntactic constraints that limit language choice within sentences. Poplack's groundbreaking 1980 work proposed the free morpheme constraint and the equivalence constraint. According to the free morpheme constraint, speakers are more likely to switch languages after constituents that are not bound morphemes. The equivalence constraint suggests that codeswitching may occur at points where the surface structures of the languages correspond to each other; that is, the juxtaposition of the elements from the two languages cannot violate syntactic rules of either

language. Although these suggested constraints were supported by studies involving typologically closely related language pairs such as English-Spanish and English-French, research with different language pairs questions the universal applicability of such rules. For example, Bokamba (1988) found that “morphologically mixed utterances” in his work with Lingala and French CS and Swahili and English CS violate many of Poplack’s proposed codeswitching constraints (p. 23), perhaps because of the highly agglutinative nature of Bantu languages. Although Poplack’s constraints may not be universally applicable across all possible groupings of languages, they represent an important early step in systematically describing the morphosyntactic workings of CS.

Among theories that grew from Poplack’s work is Myers-Scotton’s Matrix Language Frame model (1993 and 1998), which suggests several hypotheses to account for morphosyntactic patterns of CS. She begins by distinguishing two types of languages involved in codeswitching: the matrix language, also known as host language, and the embedded language, or donor. She further distinguishes content morphemes, which are similar to open-class items, e.g., verbs, prepositions, nouns, and descriptive adjectives; and system morphemes, which are similar to closed-class items and include inflections, articles, quantifiers and possessive adjectives. Her matrix language hypothesis states that the matrix language provides the order of morphemes and that system morphemes must come from the matrix language. Related to this, the blocking hypothesis states that islands of embedded language words that are not congruent to the matrix language in terms of system and content morphemes are blocked and therefore no

switching between languages is prohibited. For example, if the embedded language expresses a notion with inflection while the matrix language uses a preposition, no switching to the embedded language can occur. The Matrix Language Frame model builds on earlier work by Poplack and others in providing detailed systematic description of possible morphosyntactic mechanisms of codeswitching.

Muysken (1997) advocates a different approach to describing codeswitching structurally. Muysken suggests that apparent exceptions to constraints for codeswitching may be explained by considering not one but three structurally distinct types of intrasentential CS, namely alternation, insertion and congruent lexicalization. Alternation is described as a true switch from one language to another, which means that both grammar and lexicon switch. With alternation, there is no embedding of one language within another, but there is juxtaposition of two or more languages. In alternation, there is surface linear equivalence at the switch site, which is roughly the equivalent of Poplack's equivalence constraint. With insertion, items from one language are embedded within a frame of the other language; that is, the rules of syntax and the bulk of lexemes come from the embedding language, while items from the embedded language are subsumed in the structure of the framing language. Insertion roughly corresponds to the tenets of Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame model, in which the host language determines the order of constituents, which may then be filled by items from the donor language. CS involving congruent lexicalization requires the languages involved to "share a grammatical structure

which can be filled lexically with elements of either language” (Muysken, 1997: 362). Congruent lexicalization, according to Muysken, occurs most frequently in typologically closely related languages that share many syntactic patterns, which can then be filled with words and phrases from either language. Muysken also considers sociolinguistic settings for CS that are correlated to the structural categories of alternation, insertion and congruent lexicalization. He suggests that each type of intrasentential CS is associated with distinct sociolinguistic situations: alternation occurs most often in stable communities with a tradition of separating languages; insertion is frequent in neo-colonial and recent migrant communities where there is asymmetrical prestige of the languages; and congruent lexicalization is associated with second generation migrant groups and bilingual speakers of languages with roughly equal prestige. Muysken’s proposed categories of intra-sentential CS provide an approach to the study of language alternation that addresses both structural and sociolinguistic issues.

A final consideration in CS involves borrowing. Linguistic approaches to the phenomenon may also seek to distinguish codeswitching from other phenomena that arise when languages are in contact, such as borrowing. Borrowings or loan words first enter a language as a result of codeswitching; that is, multilingual speakers use words from one language while speaking another, and eventually, the borrowed words become part of the host language and are no longer considered so foreign. Typically, words that are borrowed into a language fill some lexical need, or there may be prestige associated with the borrowed item. The distinction between codeswitches and loans is not absolute. Poplack (1980)

suggests that borrowings are typically phonologically, morphologically and syntactically integrated into the host language; that is, they look and sound like a member of the host language. Borrowing requires only a monolingual competence, while codeswitching requires at least some competence in at least two languages (Myers-Scotton 1990). Linguists might also approach CS diachronically in order to determine the role that language alternation might play in language change over time. Codeswitching by individuals can result in long-term language change as foreign words are permanently integrated into a language or as the grammatical systems of separate languages begin to resemble one another over time.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC APPROACHES TO CODESWITCHING

A third approach to codeswitching, and the one mainly guiding this study, is sociolinguistic, which seeks to describe not how but why speakers alternate languages. This approach can be further subdivided into what Auer (1984) calls sociolinguistic and interactional approaches. Sociolinguistic approaches take a macro view of language use across entire speech communities to determine which communities engage in CS and to study the role of each language in the community. For example, this approach seeks to identify and describe speech communities in which almost everyone speaks both or all languages as well as those in which not everyone speaks all languages or not to the same degree. One might also describe communities in which languages have very different prestige and functions; for instance, one language might be the typical language of the

home and family while another is used mainly in official contexts such as school and government. Some official languages may have overt prestige while at the same time being resented because of their historic or social status, as may be the case in some former colonies. Sociolinguistic approaches to CS look at large overarching issues of language use in speech communities. In contrast, interactional approaches take a more micro view of language use, trying to identify the social meaning carried by specific switches in discourse. Such an approach closely examines conversations in order to interpret speakers' intent and the effect on the hearer. Interactional approach seek to analyze the local functions of specific examples of language alternation by studying individual switches in their conversational contexts.

One linguist who took such an interactional approach is John Gumperz. His 1982 work, *Discourse Strategies*, laid the groundwork for later studies and helped define some of the key concepts in the field of codeswitching. One distinction that Gumperz makes is between situational and conversational CS. In situational CS, language varieties are used in distinct settings and with distinct categories of speakers, and language switches coincide with changes in the setting, topic, or participants. In contrast, conversational CS is characterized as the alternating use of multiple languages within a single conversation, not necessarily with a change in setting or participant constellation. A subset of conversational CS is what Gumperz calls metaphorical codeswitching, in which speakers alternate languages in order to evoke a certain mood or to change their footing, or relative status, with respect to the other speakers. Code choice may or

may not be salient to speakers in such settings; speakers and listeners themselves must establish local norms for the interpretation of CS. That is, each speech community develops its own standards and patterns for language alternation which are part of the communicative competence for that community. Among other things, Gumperz says that speakers must learn to distinguish “meaningful and nonmeaningful contrasts” (86). This means that some code switches bear meaning while others do not, and it is up to speakers to decipher the difference. Such knowledge can only be acquired through experience in specific speech communities.

Based on research in three different multilingual speech communities, Gumperz (1982a) developed a typology that describes some common functions of metaphorical CS, a type of conversational codeswitching. Metaphorical switches involve shifts in the relative status of speakers or of the aspects of their identity which they prefer to emphasize but are not accompanied by changes in topic or other extralinguistic situation such as setting. Gumperz points out that there is no one-to-one correspondence between linguistic choice and extra-linguistic situation; that is, a code switch does not always coincide with a change in communicative intent. The following functions of codeswitching occurred in all three data sets that Gumperz examined. First, language alternation can be used to indicate that the speaker is quoting another person. The language of the original statement need not match the language of the later citation; the contrast in language variety serves to distance the speaker from the content of the quotation, not necessarily to render it in the exact words of the original. Second, speakers

may switch in order to specify their addressees; switching languages allows speakers to address specific interlocutors in a group and to exclude others, perhaps by choosing the dominant language of the person being addressed; speakers may also change languages in order to attract a listener's attention. Third, CS is used in interjections; speakers may switch because of personal emotional associations with different languages, or because certain filler expressions come to mind more readily in language than in another. Fourth, speakers use CS to reiterate their message; that is, they may repeat the same content in each of their languages in order to clarify or emphasize certain information. Fifth, CS serves to express qualifications to messages; the main content is expressed in one language, while additional explanation or detail is given in another in order to provide emphasis or clarity through linguistic contrast. Finally, CS can be used to personalize or objectivize a message; certain languages in speakers' repertoires may be used to express objective facts, while others are associated with subjective opinion. Speakers using codes associated with facts may wish to distance themselves from the content of the message or to attach a certain authority to it, while speakers using codes associated with emotion may want to emphasize their feelings rather than facts.

Related to the notion of emotional distance are Gumperz' concepts of we-code vs. they-code. In some speech communities, codes are strongly associated with political and cultural identity. In multilingual communities that include social minorities, the language of the minority is often considered the we-code, or the code that indexes in-group membership. The language of the dominant group

is the they-code and indexes power and formality, often because of its association with official political authority. We- and they-codes are often found in former colonial settings, where the language of the colonized indexes in-group membership and contrasts with the they-code of the colonizers. The notion of we- and they-codes has detractors. Sebba and Wootton (1998) point out the problem of identifying we- and they-codes and emphasize the undesirability of making a priori assumptions about how speakers feel about specific languages and of assuming a one-to-one mapping of code choice and speaker identity. It would be going too far to suggest that the notions of we-code and they-code apply to foreign language classrooms. The notions of we- and they-code are typically associated with the languages of repressed and dominant peoples, respectively; this kind of linguistic and political repression is not typical in foreign language classrooms in the U.S. However, I do believe that the distinction is relevant to the current study. Some of the codeswitching observed in foreign language classes can be attributed to the teachers' desire to relate to their students on a personal level and not simply to convey information. For intermediate language learners with a limited grasp of the target language, the students' native language may be the best way to make interpersonal connections, and so the learners' L1 serves as a marker of in-group membership and solidarity that in some ways parallels Gumperz' notion of a we-code.

Appel and Muysken (1987) describe a functional model of CS to explain why speakers alternate languages. They identify six functions of CS: referential, directive, expressive, phatic, metalinguistic and poetic. Referential switches

occur because of lack of knowledge or facility in one language on a certain subject. Speakers are often quite conscious of such topic-related switching and therefore give lack of linguistic knowledge as the reason for their switching (p. 118). Directive switching serves to include or exclude specific conversational participants by using either a speaker's preferred or dispreferred language choice. Such participant-related switching, which Gumperz calls addressee specification, can be convergent, when speakers use their interlocutors' preferred language, or divergent, which may create distance between speaker and hearer because of dispreferred choices. (The notion of accommodation will be discussed in more detail below.) Expressive CS may serve mainly to express the multilingual status of the speaker, whereby each individual switch does not necessarily carry specific meaning, but the overall pattern of language use does, and suggested by Poplack (1980). Phatic switches, which are comparable to Gumperz' metaphorical switches, use language alternation to change the tone of conversations. Metalinguistic switches occur when speakers wish to comment on their own language use either directly or indirectly; the use of a contrasting linguistic code makes the comments more salient. Finally, CS may serve poetic functions, as speakers switch languages for the beauty and pleasure of it as they make puns, tell jokes and produce poetry in multiple languages. The functions that Appel and Muysken describe overlap to some extent with Gumperz' proposed typology but the two sets are distinct from one another. The fact that the lists of functions produced by these different researchers underscores Appel and Muysken's point that the functions of CS vary widely from one speech community to the next.

Gumperz' and Appel and Muysken's theories about the functions of CS have certain parallels with Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (1988 and 1993). The Markedness Model is based on the notion that for many multilingual exchanges, speakers have a range of language choices, from the marked to the unmarked. Unmarked choices are the norm and are more expected and more customary, while marked choices are a deviation from the norm. Not every type of exchange is clearly associated with a specific unmarked code choice, although many exchanges are conventionalized. The Markedness Model posits that speakers can deliberately choose to use a more marked code in order to change their relative position or status, or, in other words, to negotiate a new rights and obligations set. Code choice conveys important information about identity and attitudes of the speaker. Speakers are free to make such choices but they cannot determine exactly how those choices will be interpreted by their interlocutors. Myers-Scotton proposes four types of codeswitching: sequential unmarked CS, CS as an unmarked choice, CS as a marked choice, and exploratory CS. In sequential unmarked CS, the unmarked code changes when the situation or topic or constellation of participants changes. In this type of CS, speakers switch languages only when the changing speech situation dictates such a change. When CS is an unmarked choice, language alternation is the norm for the entire conversation, and switches are typically smooth, with no hesitation or changes in prosody. Each individual switch does not carry meaning, but the overall pattern of using CS in this manner does. When codeswitching is a marked choice, speakers typically wish to renegotiate the rights and obligations sets that are

associated with certain languages; in other words, by changing languages, they intend to change their footing to their interlocutor. Such CS can be used either to increase or decrease social distance to other speakers and is comparable to Gumperz' metaphorical switching. Finally, exploratory CS occurs when speakers are uncertain which code is the unmarked one in a given situation, possibly because the setting is novel or because speakers are unfamiliar with their interlocutors' language skills and preferences.

Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model is important for this study for several reasons. First, it emphasizes that speakers have choices regarding which language they speak, and that these choices have social consequences. Speakers can choose to use codes that are more marked in given settings and the linguistic choice itself carries meaning. Language choice can index social distance or proximity, authority or solidarity, depending on the setting and constellation of speakers. A second tenet of the Markedness Model is the idea that markedness is universal, although the specific details are unique to particular speech communities. That is, while every speech community has codes which are more or less customary, an understanding of which code is appropriate in which setting and with which interlocutors is community specific and must be acquired or negotiated. I believe that foreign language classrooms can be considered emerging speech communities with norms of their own which must be learned, just as they are learned in other communities. I discuss the notion of speech communities below, in the section entitled *Foreign languages classes as emerging multilingual speech communities*.

Knowing which language is appropriate at any given time requires considering the abilities and desires of the interlocutor. Myers-Scotton postulates two maxims regulating language choice, the deference maxim and the virtuosity maxim (Myers-Scotton 1990). The deference maxim states that speakers should show deference in their code choice to those from whom they desire something; one should especially defer languages in order to mitigate a face-threatening act. That is, one should speak the preferred language of a higher ranked or more powerful interlocutor. The virtuosity maxim states that speakers should make otherwise marked choices when the linguistic ability of either party makes the unmarked choice inopportune. In other words, language choices depend not only on the setting and topic but also on the relative linguistic ability and preferred languages of the speakers involved. Related to Myers-Scotton's maxims are Grice's principles that describe the conventions that speakers normally obey in order to make conversations successful (Grice 1975); he describes the principles of quantity, quality, relation and manner. The principle of quantity states that speakers' contributions should be as informative as required but no longer; the principle of quality states that speakers should say only what they believe to be true; the principle of relation states that speakers' contributions should be relevant to the discussion; and the principle of manner states that speakers should avoid ambiguity or obscurity. If these principles hold true for conversations generally, then surely they are valid for classroom instruction. In that case, at least some of foreign language teachers' switches to students' native language could be motivated by a desire to communicate simply and efficiently with their students.

Although Myers-Scotton's deference principle does not necessarily apply here, because students do not have more power than teachers, perhaps the virtuosity principle and Grice's principle of manner do. That is, while foreign language teachers strive to speak as the target language so that their students can learn it, they also strive to communicate with their students as easily as possible. Teachers must balance their desire to communicate simply and efficiently with their need to challenge their students to understand the target language. Perhaps these dual purposes can account for some of teachers' classroom codeswitching.

Some classroom codeswitching can be explained by accommodation theory. Giles, Coupland and Coupland (1991) describe accommodation as a complex set of alternatives from which speakers may choose in order to achieve solidarity with or dissociation from conversational partners (p. 2). Giles et al. distinguish convergent from divergent linguistic behavior. Convergent speakers adapt to others' language behavior, while divergent speakers accentuate differences between themselves and their interlocutors. The language behaviors that are modified include verbal, prosodic and nonverbal features; for example, speakers can choose to vary their language choice, styles, register, volume, rate, physical proximity, and gestures in response to their interlocutors. Giles et al. explain that the motivation for accommodation is often a speaker's or group's desire for social integration or identification with another or a need for social approval (p. 18), and mutual convergence likely serves to "enhance shared couple and family identities as well as emergent small-group identities" (p. 26). Therefore, teachers may choose to use learners' L1 not only to achieve efficient

communication or to fill learners' lexical gaps, but to enhance interpersonal relations in the classroom; shared linguistic practices may contribute to emerging speech communities' norms. It is possible to overaccommodate to a conversation partner, that is, to use too many of the interlocutor's speech features; such overattuning can be considered patronizing or demeaning. In a foreign language classroom, overaccommodation might mean using learners' L1 more than is necessary for efficient communication; that is, teachers might use the learners' native language when they could have been understood in the L2. Such linguistic overaccommodation might be the result of underestimating students' comprehension skills.

STUDIES OF CODESWITCHING IN BILINGUAL AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES

Numerous studies have addressed the question of the ideal roles of learners' first language in bilingual and foreign language classes. Jacobson (1990) describes traditional bilingual methodology in the United States that assumed that the two languages being learned would or should be kept separate, whether on the basis of speaker (e.g., having different teachers speak different languages to the learners), subject matter, time or place. Despite this traditional assumption of the separation of languages, both languages can also be used at the same time, following different patterns, or switching between the two can be random, following no principled rules. In concurrent translation, both languages are used to present the same content, with two versions of the content typically said in succession. In one principled way of using both languages, the students'

native language is used to preview lesson content, while the target language is used for the bulk of the lesson, or the lesson can be in the target language while a review is conducted in the L1; in either case, the content is presented in both languages in a systematic way. The New Concurrent Approach, described in Jacobson (1981), advocates a principled functional distribution of languages in content courses taught bilingually in the U.S. In this approach, teachers must monitor their language use in order to ensure that language alternation achieves pedagogically sound objectives and that switches occur in response to specific linguistic, educational and social cues. The cues fall into four categories. First are classroom strategies, which include review of material, capturing students' attention, and praise. Second, switches due to curricular cues help to maintain appropriate language use according to the topics and texts being discussed. Third, teachers switching in response to language development cues may be considering students' language dominance and lexical development. Finally, interpersonal relationship cues to codeswitching help to maintain rapport with students and establish intimate or formal tones.

Zentella (1981) similarly studies bilingual education in the U.S., although she describes not ideal, codified practices but observed patterns of behavior. She suggests that studies of CS in such settings must consider children's interlocutors, since speakers' age, sex, speech style and in-group membership status can be significant in influencing codeswitching behavior. Her data confirm previous studies that suggest that bilinguals older than five years old tended to speak as they were spoken to, that is, to respond in the language in which they were

addressed; however, she suggests that older children may also speak their own preferred language if they know that their interlocutors share that language. Overall, she suggests that teachers' language choices had a clear effect on learners' language use. She observed three patterns of bilingual discourse in the classes she observed. First is what she calls "follow the leader," that is, that speakers used the language that was spoken to them. Second, some teachers tended to follow the child and to use the child's preferred language. Finally, some teachers included both the child's choice and their own in their replies to children. For example, if a teacher asks a question in English and the child replies in Spanish, the teacher might then use both English and Spanish in a mixed-language response. This study focuses mainly on the influence of interlocutors' language choice and personal characteristics on bilingual classroom codeswitching patterns.

In contrast, other studies of classroom CS have focused on the functions performed by different languages. For example, Piasecka (1988) suggests that the use of students' native language in ESL classes in Poland should be a joint decision between teachers and students. The availability of this shared linguistic resource is empowering to learners. When teachers and students share a cultural and linguistic background, there can be closer understanding and sympathy between them because teachers can better understand learners' difficulties than would someone from a different background (97). Piasecka provides a list of many possible occasions for using students' native language, including classroom management, record-keeping, language analysis, presentation of grammatical,

phonological and spelling rules, explanation and correction of errors, discussion of cross-cultural issues, assessment of comprehension, and personal contact. The author provides no ranking of the functions in this list, neither according to the frequency nor to the desirability or effectiveness of their use.

Two studies by Polio and Duff (Duff and Polio 1990, and Polio and Duff 1994) are relevant to the current study because they examine both quantitatively and qualitatively the use of English and the foreign language in university FL classes in the U.S. The earlier study measured the relative amounts of English and the target language spoken in thirteen different language classes. Despite having controlled many variables—for example, all instructors were native speakers of the languages they taught, and the classes were all second-quarter four-skills courses—there was great variation among teachers in the amount of the target language spoken in class, ranging from 10-100%. In their second study, Polio and Duff (1994) examined recordings of the foreign language classes investigated in their first study in order to determine the functions for which English was used in each of the classes. Because of the expense of transcription and translation of the recordings, only six hours of data from the original study were examined in the follow-up study, one each from instructors of six different languages. The researchers identified eight categories of English use in the classroom: administrative vocabulary, grammar instruction, classroom management, indexing solidarity, for English practice by the teacher, providing translations of unknown target language vocabulary, remedying apparent lack of student comprehension, and interaction effect involving students' use of English

(that is, teachers switched to English in response to students' use of English). In interviews, the instructors gave reasons for their use of English for certain functions; the main one cited are learners' lack of requisite vocabulary and the complexity and importance of content. The authors critique some reasons for using the L1 in class, suggesting that time would be better spent speaking the target language, and they provide suggestions for avoiding unnecessary use of the students' L1. While the authors admit that it is difficult to make generalizations about all instructors based on these six hours of data, their results shed some light on teachers' actual use of students' native language in these FL classes.

Numerous studies in other academic settings also seek to describe patterns of codeswitching in foreign and second language classes. In his study of South African high schools, for example, Adendorff (1996) found codeswitching to be a communicative resource that enabled teachers and students to accomplish both educational and social objectives. In this setting, English was the official language of instruction, but the teacher used the students' and the teachers' native language, Zulu, to fulfill several social functions such as expressing encouragement and marking solidarity with students. Zulu was also used to manage the classroom. Adendorff suggests that teachers use codeswitching to express solidarity, power and distance. He suggests the need for teacher training and consciousness-raising in order to encourage teachers to see multilingualism as a communicative resource rather than a curse and to sensitize teachers to the notion that language choice is not neutral but has important symbolic associations.

In contrast to studies that focus on teachers' language use, Ogaine (1997) studied functions and contexts of codeswitching among Japanese learners of English as a second language in Canada. She considered switches from English to Japanese according to such categories as tags, interjections, fixed expressions, nouns, conjunctions, adjectives, adverbs, phrases and sentences. She found that various categories of switches were associated with different functions. For example tag-switches and conjunctions were used to gain thinking time; that is, speakers codeswitched to their native language for these words and phrases in order to stall while they planned the rest of their utterance in their second language. These students tended to use Japanese for such items as interjections, adjectives and adverbs in order to express their feelings and their solidarity with their classmates. Ogaine suggests that the students' goal in the class was not merely to learn English but to get along with each other, and that using Japanese helped them accomplish this interpersonal goal. She stresses the importance of including bi- and multilingual models in discussions of foreign language competence and performance, since students are learning to be bilingual, not monolingual.

Many reasons are cited for teachers and students using students' native language in class, but one that is commonly cited even by non-linguists seems to be lexical gaps. In his study of German learners of English in a bilingual German school, Butzkamm (1998) found the students' native language to be what he called a conversational lubricant. In the class he observed, German was not used for social purposes but for educational ones, as students switched from German to

English principally to ask for the vocabulary they needed in order to contribute to a class discussion. The students' L1 was used only as a bilingual dictionary and made teaching more efficient, as students could easily learn the words they needed to express themselves. Butzkamm suggests that teachers should consider students' native language a natural shortcut to learning that should be utilized where appropriate, instead of avoiding codeswitching in class entirely. It should be pointed out that the class observed was a history class in a bilingual school, where pupils presumably have other contact with English and many other opportunities to speak and hear English; moreover, the students were in their third year of English and were therefore more advanced in their foreign language than the students in the current study. Thus the "bilingual dictionary" function of students' L1 in this class may not be the most common in the classes considered in the current study.

Antón and DiCamilla (1998) suggest that learners' codeswitching can serve not only lexical needs but also socio-cognitive ones. The researchers conducted qualitative analyses of students' interaction during pair work and determined that learners' L1 serves significant inter- and intrapsychological needs. Interpsychologically, the L1 helped learners to communicate with each other and to help provide scaffolding for one another. That is, learners used their shared native language in order to accomplish tasks together, with each learner contributing his or her own grammatical and lexical knowledge to the production of a written text. The native language also helped to organize the accomplishing of the task, with learners using their native language to share strategies, decide

how to solve problems, and to retain their focus on the task. Intrapsychologically, the L1 was the medium for personal speech, that is, self-directed speech that the learners used while thinking through the cognitively complex task. For the learners studied, native language served both cognitive and social needs.

Legenhausen (1991) likewise suggests that the reasons for learners' codeswitching go beyond lexical gaps; he claims that only a small proportion of learners' codeswitching can be described as compensatory. He believes that learners' linguistic behavior can be better understood if research on bilingual discourse is considered. Therefore he identifies three types and functions of codeswitching that are not specific to language learners: CS as a psycholinguistic phenomenon (that is, the term for some notions might be more salient in one language than in another); CS as a discourse strategy (CS can serve to regulate turns, attract attention, emphasize certain information); and CS mode as a register in its own right (cf. Myers-Scotton's CS as unmarked choice). To compare learners' CS to that of other bilinguals', he studied the classroom interaction of German students learning French. There were groups with three and five years of exposure to French, and each worked with a computer simulation while their teacher was out of the room. He found "overwhelming evidence" that the L1 was not used primarily as a compensatory device; instead, learners' codeswitching seemed to parallel that of other bilinguals, with the native language being used for a range of purposes, including the expression of emotional involvement and the assertion of learners' individual identities (Legenhausen 1991, p. 69). He also observed that not every switch can be described in terms of specific functions or

strategies; that is, speakers' various reasons for switching were not always evident to observers.

Several studies describe the ways that codeswitching can serve social functions in the classroom. The terms that the various researchers use vary but they parallel each other, in that they all describe the ways that learners alternate languages in order to negotiate social identities, tending to use one language for official classroom purposes and another for more personal communication. For example, Canagarajah (1995) described the languages used in classrooms in Jaffna for various microfunctions, such as giving directions, managing discipline, giving commands, reviewing content and requesting help. She determined that English, the L2, was used primarily for interaction strictly related to the textbook and the lesson, but Tamil, the L1, was used for all other interactions, for example, those that were personal or unofficial in nature. She suggests that language mixing in the classroom allows students the opportunity to learn the values behind each code and to discover how to negotiate identities through codeswitching, important lessons in a larger multilingual society that must grapple with exactly these issues.

Hancock (1997) similarly distinguishes social functions of language in foreign language classes. He speaks of different layers of discourse and suggests that the unmarked code for each layer might be different. Hancock's term *hyers* seems to correspond to register or topic. He distinguishes between on-record and off-record discourse, which parallels Canagarajah's official and unofficial uses of language. When learners are performing as part of official class activities, they

are on record, whereas asides and other more personal utterances are off record. He reports that code choice and volume change are both contextualization cues that learners used to signal whether their utterances were on or off record. Hancock suggests that the unmarked language choice varies according to layer of discourse, that is, whether the speech is meant to be on or off record; in the classes he observed, the unmarked code for off-record speech is the learners' L1, while the unmarked code for on-record speech is the L2. Although Hancock does not believe that all use of learners' L1 is bad, he does suggest ways to minimize students' use of their L1 in class.

Tarone and Swain's (1995) study of the function and social distribution of languages in grade school immersion classes suggests reasons for the distribution of languages. For the learners of English as a second language that they observed, the L2 was the institutional language of academic discourse, that is, the official language of the classroom, while the vernacular version of the children's L1 was the language of peer-to-peer social discourse. This parallels Hancock's notion of on-record and off-record speech, where one language serves as the official language of classroom discourse while the other is more personal and therefore off record. A possible reason for the observed dichotomy among second-language learners is that students do not yet have access to a vernacular style in their L2. Tarone and Swain suggest the need to explicitly teach vernacular style of the L2 along with the notion of sociostylistic variation.

Moffatt (1991), in her study of three- and four-year-old Panjabi speakers in England, found that even young speakers varied their language choice

according to topic and the interlocutors' native language. That is, even young children had learned how to choose among the languages at their disposal, with certain languages being associated with specific topics and people. The teachers of these classes expressed the importance of using students' L1 for cognitive and linguistic reasons, such as the efficiency of learning and the need to extend these young children's L1 ability; they also mentioned emotional and social reasons, such as self-esteem, and the prevention of possible downgrading of the status of the L1. Clearly, the needs of young bilinguals such as those Moffatt studied are significantly different from those of university-level foreign language learners in the U.S. However, the codeswitching behavior with both groups is influenced by both cognitive and social factors.

Nizegorodcew (1996) describes some functions of the shared L1 of both teacher and learners in Polish classes of English as a foreign language. She underscores the need to look beyond lexical gaps as an explanation for classroom codeswitching, since teachers do alternate languages but clearly could express themselves in one language. She suggests that the use of the shared L1 relinquishes some power from teacher and makes interaction less formal; the tendency to use the L1 was observed particularly among teachers who perceived difficulty among their students. Nizegorodcew suggests that the L1 should not be completely avoided in the classroom because it provides a sense of security and comfort to learners: "There always remain situations in which it is more appropriate to address an interlocutor sharing the same mother tongue in that language" (p. 213).

The studies discussed above all make similar distinctions between personal and official language use in foreign and second language classrooms. The terms on and off stage, on and off record, official and personal, official and peer-to-peer language, cognitive/linguistic vs. emotional/social have clear parallels to one another, and these studies suggest that motivations for codeswitching are complex and comprise much more than simply occasions when one cannot remember a particular word. Such varied reasons for codeswitching will be considered as part of the qualitative analyses in the Findings chapter.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES AS EMERGING MULTILINGUAL SPEECH COMMUNITIES

The linguistic habits of many diverse speech communities have been studied, and settings and norms previously considered odd or anomalous have been shown to be ordered, legitimate systems. On the other hand, classrooms, particularly foreign language classrooms, have often been characterized as unnatural. Teachers often decide in advance the subject of class discussions, while other discussions do not have a priori topics. Teachers ask a lot of display questions, that is, questions to which they already know the answers, while questions in other types of interaction are likely to solicit new information. Kramsch (1985) describes and contrasts “instructional” and “natural” discourse. She suggests that interaction in foreign language classes “should not be purely instructional, nor can it be entirely natural” (181). This means that although teachers should strive toward natural language use in their classes, they cannot fully achieve this goal because classroom language use is inherently unnatural.

The belief that discourse patterns in foreign language classrooms are unnatural is widespread.

Despite claims to the contrary, classrooms do have their own rules of conduct, standards and norms. Researchers have identified several typical characteristics of classroom behavior. For example, in most classrooms, teachers have the privileged right not only to speak but also to allocate turns, that is, to decide who speaks next and for how long, while students' fixed status is lower than that of teachers (Markee 2000). Such distribution of turns often results in the IRE sequences that typify classroom interaction. In such sequences, the teacher initiates a topic (I), and a student provides a response (R), which is then evaluated (E) in a follow-up comment by the teacher, who has reclaimed the floor. As discussed briefly above, Kramsch (1985) contrasted instructional discourse with what she called natural discourse. For example, the roles in natural discourse are negotiated within the group, while in instructional discourse, relative status is fixed. While natural discourse focuses on process and fluency of interaction, instructional discourse focuses on content and accuracy of facts. The differences Kramsch described are real, but the characterization of instructional discourse as unnatural seems unfounded. Her description of typical features of classroom language parallels descriptions of other established speech communities. That is, the very possibility of describing typical features of a classroom suggests a systematicity that would not be found in unnatural settings. Each speech community has its own norms, and it is not surprising that norms differ from one speech community to the next. Certain features of classroom discourse are

labeled non-communicative or unnatural because they do not appear in the small informal group communication to which language classes are often compared. Cullen (1998) pointed out that the established patterns of large formal gatherings are likely to be very different from the norms of small informal gatherings. He suggested that classrooms should be evaluated based on what is communicative in the instructional setting itself rather than on what may be communicative in other settings. Seedhouse (1994) similarly stated that it is essential to judge classrooms not with respect to what he calls real-world standards but according to the community's own purpose. His description of classrooms as distinct from the "real world" is unfortunate given that classroom instruction comprises a large part of the real world of students and teachers alike; however, his description of classes as recognizable communities is apt.

Blyth (1995) proposed that considering the classroom as a multilingual speech community may help to redefine curricular boundaries. While he acknowledges the difficulty of considering disparate groups of beginning language learners a social group, he suggested that imagining classrooms in this way might help to provide learners with more appropriate language norms to emulate. Typically, monolingual native speakers are held up as the standard-bearers that language learners should imitate, an odd choice given that adult language learners cannot ever become native speakers of the language that they're learning, nor are they striving to become monolinguals of another language but multilinguals. Cook (1999) similarly suggests that L2 users' attainment should be considered in its own right rather than in comparison to native speakers; he argues

that L2 users should be viewed as “multicompetent language users rather than as deficient native speakers” (p. 185). Appropriate models for students are competent multilinguals who are able to function within their communities. The first multilingual speech community that learners are a part of, then, is that of their foreign language classroom.

It is easier to regard a foreign language classroom a speech community after considering various definitions of the notion. Hymes (1972), Gumperz (1972) and Sridhar (1996) all emphasize that membership in speech communities requires knowing rules for interaction: speech communities are “communities sharing rules for the conduct and interpretations of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety” (Hymes 1972, p. 54). Gumperz’ definition emphasizes the need to share “knowledge of the communicative constraints and options governing a significant number of social situations” (Gumperz 1972). Hymes furthermore suggests that definitions should begin with social groups and then consider all linguistic varieties present, because speech communities are primarily social rather than linguistic entities. Similarly, Gumperz (1962) states that there is no a priori reason to define speech communities so that all speakers speak the same language. Thus, in the classroom as well as in “the real world,” speech communities contain speakers who do not all share the same level of competence in all of the languages spoken in that community. As long as there are shared rules and norms for communication, a group may be considered a speech community. Because

foreign language classes are dynamic and are constantly evolving, I refer to them as emerging speech communities.

It may seem far fetched to describe language learners as bilingual, but it is important to consider various notions of what it means to use two or more languages. Early discussions of bilingualism equated being bilingual with being a “perfect” or “balanced” bilingual, that is, one who has equal and perfect control over all aspects of both languages. Bloomfield (1933), for example, defined bilingualism as native-like control of two languages. Weinreich (1968) similarly speaks of the linguistic behavior of “ideal” bilinguals who have equally and perfectly acquired both of their languages. Haugen (1969), in contrast, suggested that bilingualism begins when a speaker can produce meaningful sentences in the second language. In fact, many scholars in recent decades have emphasized that the notion of a perfect bilingual is not appropriate for many multilingual speech communities, because many speakers use their various languages in very different domains. Myers-Scotton’s work in Nairobi, for example, demonstrated the various roles that English, Swahili and local, tribal languages play in speakers’ daily lives; because each language is more appropriate in some circumstances and less appropriate in others, speakers do not need to be able to perform every sort of speech act in every one of their languages. Auer (1984) defined bilingualism not as a cognitive state but something that can be displayed and performed; this suggests that being able to do something in a second language means one has some claim to being bilingual. Mackey (1968) suggests that identifying the point at which one becomes bilingual is arbitrary or impossible,

and therefore bilingualism is simply the alternate use of two or more languages. Valdes-Fallis also stresses the ability to “function to whatever degree in more than one language”(Valdes-Fallis 1978, 4). Diebold (1964) used the term incipient bilingual to describe learners who do not have full control over their second language but who are able to function to some extent in it; a minimal proficiency requirement is not specified. After consideration of such varied functional definitions of bilingualism, I believe that intermediate foreign language students can be considered emergent bilinguals. Such developing bilinguals can take part in the speech community of a classroom even if they do not use their second language in other domains of their lives.

Although all members of speech communities develop an understanding of the norms of that community, foreign language teachers, because of their authoritative roles in the classroom, play an especially significant role in establishing norms there. The decisions that teachers make about language use patterns are based on many factors, such as their own experience as language learners and teachers, their training as instructors, and their perception of students’ proficiency. Language use patterns vary depending on the teaching approach employed. Traditional methods such as grammar-translation rely heavily on learners’ native language, since they assume that foreign languages are learned by comparison to the native language and mastery of the language is generally demonstrated by translating into and out of the foreign language. Other approaches, such as the natural approach, the direct method and the audiolingual method require that classroom discourse take place in the target language, that is,

in the language to be learned. Proponents of such approaches believe that foreign languages are learned most efficiently without the use of students' native language. Between these two poles lie cognitive and proficiency approaches, in which the students' native language is permitted a limited role in the classroom, for example, for grammar explanations and for discussion of learning strategies. Because of an overall trend away from traditional methods to more proficiency-oriented approaches to language teaching, there has been increased emphasis on high levels of target language use in the classroom.

Before beginning my study, I expected that teachers would continue to use significant amounts of the students' L1 in class, despite the commonly held belief that the TL should be used almost exclusively. Because of these prevailing beliefs, teachers are sometimes reluctant to admit or unable to describe the ways in which they personally use the students' L1 in the classroom, and surveys are therefore not always very informative about actual language behavior (see, for example, Polio and Duff [1994]). Preston (1986) refers to this uncertainty as the reporter's paradox: "The surer you are that a piece of behavior of your own or another is accurately reported, the more you should distrust it" (p. 21). Gumperz likewise reports discrepancies between self-reports and empirical observation. He states that multilinguals are not usually able to remember what language they used in any particular exchange, and asking them to report on which language they used is no more effective than asking a monolingual to report on incidence of future tenses (Gumperz 1982, p. 62). Therefore, studies that analyze actual classroom language behavior are necessary.

Chapter 3: Methods

SUBJECTS

This study is based on audio- and videotaped data collected in second-year German language classes at the University of Texas at Austin during the Spring and Fall semesters of 2000. All instructors of second-year level courses were asked to participate in the study. One instructor declined to take part in the study, and the recordings from another instructor's classes were unusable because of equipment failure. In the end, the study was based on eight instructors' classes—three are native speakers of German and five are native speakers of American English, four are male and four are female. I collected one hour of data from one instructor, but at least two hours from each of the others, yielding a total of seventeen hours of classroom data.

The second year of language instruction was chosen as the focus of study because of the students' relatively more advanced state compared to students in first-year courses and because of the relative difficulty of the material covered. By the second year of language study, students have acquired considerable vocabulary and grammar and should be able to say and understand much more German than their first-year counterparts. In earlier courses, many of teachers' codeswitches are no doubt motivated by students' limited language skills. On the other hand, some of the material covered in second-year classes is more complex than that dealt with in the first year. For example, in second-year German courses at the University of Texas, students read and discuss authentic texts that can be

difficult to understand and interpret, because of both the complexity of the language used and the subject matter. In addition, the grammatical topics taught in second-year classes are often perceived by teachers and students alike as difficult to learn, for example, passive voice, relative clauses and subjunctive mood. It is the interplay of students' improving linguistic skills and the course's increasingly complex grammatical and thematic content that made the second year an interesting level to study.

The decision to focus on teachers' rather than students' codeswitching also was related to students' developing ability to speak and understand German. Some codeswitching is motivated by simple lexical gaps; that is, some bilingual speakers switch to another language simply because they cannot think of the appropriate word at a given moment. While it is likely that teachers' codeswitching is occasionally motivated by such momentary lexical difficulty, it is reasonable to expect that teachers' switches are also motivated by other factors, such as their perception of students' ability to understand spoken German, the difficulty of the task at hand, their own experiences as teachers and learners, as well as interpersonal and affective factors. I assume that experienced instructors switch more or less intentionally at least some of the time and that teachers' switches to English are intended to reach some interpersonal or pedagogical goal, although not every switch can be attributed to clearly defined intentions, and not all switches are planned and thought out in advance. A final reason for focusing on teachers' rather than students' speech was practical: teachers tend to speak more in class, even in more student-centered classes. Instructors' relative

dominance of class time varies depending on personal style, of course, and different instructors did speak varying amounts in class. However, teachers produced overall more speech during which codeswitching could occur.

PREPARING TO OBSERVE CLASSES

Before visiting each class, I consulted with course instructors to ensure that I would not be visiting on test days or other inopportune days. Instructors were told simply that the goal of the study was to describe the way language is used in foreign language classes. I promised to explain the specific goals of the study after I had observed and recorded their classes but I did not give details before my observations in order to limit the effects of the observer's paradox. That is, I kept the specific topic of my study from instructors and tried to be as unobtrusive as possible so that the behavior that I observed would not differ substantially from what normally occurred in the classroom (Bogdan and Biklen 1998, p. 35). The presence of another instructor as well as recording equipment probably did have some effect on the way that teachers conducted class. However, all graduate student instructors at the University are accustomed to being observed by their supervisors, either professors or advanced graduate students who coordinate multi-section courses. Since I had served as supervisor in the past, I had previously observed some of the instructors involved in this study, a fact that I hope further reduced any changes in the instructors' behavior.

Similarly, the students in the classes I observed were given little detail about the nature of the study. Typically, class sessions that I observed began with

the teacher introducing me briefly, either in German or in English. I then made a brief statement in English about why I was there. Like the teachers, the students were told that the study's purpose was to describe the way language is used in foreign language classes, but they were not told that codeswitching was the focus of the study. I pointed out the camera in the back of the room and asked if any students wanted to move so that even the backs of their heads would not be filmed. No one in any of the classes that I visited moved away from the camera. A flyer was distributed that gave information about the study and how to contact me or my thesis advisor, and class continued.

DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected using an audio tape recorder and a Super-8 video camera on a tripod. The audio recorder was placed near the front of the room, generally on a desk or chair near the teacher's desk, while I sat at the back of the room with the video camera aimed at the instructor in the front of the room. I tried to be as unobtrusive as possible while recording but occasional problems with recording equipment drew attention to its and my presence in the classroom. Although the teachers were occasionally not centered in the camera's view, their speech was always recorded. I always stayed in the classroom while recording. Occasionally the teacher addressed me during class, for example, to ask if I knew specific vocabulary or departmental policies, but usually I was not included in the class after initial introductions.

In addition to recording classroom interaction, I also administered surveys to teachers and students about their beliefs about language use in second year German classes. The surveys were adapted from course materials provided by a colleague at the University of Wisconsin, Monika Chavez. With these questionnaires, I hoped to collect information about teachers and students that would help to contextualize the exchanges I witnessed in class. The two surveys addressed the same topics, though the wording varied and were distributed only after I had recorded teachers' classes. The survey asked teachers and students about the suitability of each language for typical classroom activities and about their goals for the class. The introduction to the teacher survey specifically asks teachers about their personal beliefs; the student survey similarly asks about their personal preferences about their teachers' language use. Demographic data was also requested from the survey-takers, such as native language, other languages spoken, prior language learning experience, and prior language teaching experience. The surveys are included in Appendices A and B.

TRANSCRIBING THE RECORDINGS

After collecting the recordings, I transcribed them, working mainly from the audiotapes. I used normal German spelling rules; mispronunciation was noted only when it was an important feature of classroom talk, for example, when it produced misunderstanding. Although teachers' codeswitching was the focus of the study, all discernible classroom talk was transcribed because student talk is an important part of the context of teachers' speech. I identified teachers in the

transcripts by the first letters of their pseudonyms; students are represented as S for single students or Ss for multiple simultaneous speakers. While transcribing, I included features of talk that were likely to serve as contextualization cues, that is, features that would help provide understanding of the interaction. Such features include pauses, changes in intonation and volume, gestures, interruptions and overlapping speech. Students' facial expressions would no doubt have provided further context for teacher talk, but the position of the video camera prevented me from seeing and including such gestures in my transcripts.

The following transcription conventions are adapted from work by Psathas (1995), Hinnenkamp (1996), and Tannen (1989). Passages that were not comprehensible after multiple listenings were rendered as three x's in parentheses, e.g., (xxx). Passages that were unclear but about which I could make a reasonable guess based on responses to those utterances were indicated by placing the assumed wording in parentheses, e.g., (also). Utterances spoken at lower volume were placed between percent symbols, e.g., %that's all you do%, and passages spoken at a higher volume were written in all capital letters, e.g., OH NO. Pauses were indicated by a period in parentheses e.g., (.). I did not time pauses in seconds but instead noted pauses only when they were apparent based on the speakers' own rates of speech. Some features, such as changes in speed and volume, were included to a lesser extent and were indicated by comments in brackets within the transcripts. I used my intuition as a language teacher and as a speaker of German and English to determine which variances were noteworthy. Where appropriate, non-verbal behaviors such as pointing or mime were indicated

in the transcripts in square brackets. A list of all symbols used in transcriptions is included in Appendix C.

Some portions of the recordings remained unclear or unusable despite repeated listening and watching of the videotapes. For example, most teachers that I observed incorporated group work into their classes. Because I had only two centrally located recorders, it was impossible to distinguish the speech of individual students during group work because so much talk happened simultaneously. Following the work of Ogaine (1997), who omitted small group work from her study, this project is based on teachers' utterances during whole-class interaction. The amount of usable data per observation was also limited by quizzes that were given during class time. Although I consulted with instructors to make sure that there was no tests scheduled on the days I would visit their classes, brief quizzes of less than ten minutes were sometimes given while I was there.

NUMERIC ANALYSIS OF TRANSCRIPTS

Analyses of transcripts were both quantitative and qualitative. Numeric analyses consisted of identifying and counting communication units (c-units) of teachers' talk. Following Loban's (1966) definition, I considered c-units to be independent clauses along with attached or embedded subordinate clauses; also included are isolated phrases which do not have a subject and a verb but which nonetheless have communicative value, such as elliptical answers to questions. Loban states that c-units should be defined using both formal and semantic

criteria. Crookes (1990) points out that traditional units such as the sentence are better suited for analysis of written rather than spoken language; the t-unit was rejected as a possible unit of analysis because it requires the presence of a verb, something not all communicative language contains. For example, the response to the question “where are you going” could be “I’m going to the store to buy milk” or “I’m going to the store,” or simply “to the store;” each of the three responses consists of a single c-unit.

Despite the seeming clarity of the definition of c-unit, there were ambiguous cases where I had to make decisions of where c-units started and stopped. I chose to include transition words and false starts consisting of two or three words with the following c-unit if the two parts together formed one semantic unit. For example, the utterance “Now, em, there’s another way of saying this of course” counted as one c-unit because the word “now,” though separated by a brief pause from the following words, seemed to introduce the next thought and not be separate from it. When spoken alone, words such as *yeah*, *ja* and *OK* were not counted as separate c-units for either German or English because of the difficulty in labeling them either English or German; that is, because of their phonetic similarity across languages, these words might have been German or English. When words such as *yeah* and *OK* were spoken as transition words as described above, they were included as part of the utterance that followed or preceded. Borrowed words were also a source of ambiguity. Two high-frequency borrowings in this corpus are *quiz* and *handout*; they were considered German words if they were phonologically and syntactically

integrated into otherwise German sentences. For example, in the following excerpt, Dieter syntactically and phonologically incorporates the word *quizzes* into his German. The determiner *eure* is declined as it would be before any plural noun in German, and Dieter pronounces the word with an initial /kv/ as in German; therefore this utterance was treated as being monolingually German. Here, as in all examples cited, the original transcript is cited first, followed by an English translation. In the English translation, I use italics to indicate where the original language was German.

- 1 D: Gut, so, noch mal ganz kurz
- 2 Habt ihr alle eure, eure Quizzes angeschaut?
- 3 Seht ihr irgendwelche Probleme?

- 1 D: *Good, so, again really briefly*
- 2 *Have you all looked at your, your quizzes?*
- 3 *Do you see any problems?*

Once identified, the c-units were categorized according to both the language spoken and topic. I counted the number of c-units that each teacher produced in both German and English and categorized those c-units according to their topics. The categories of classroom topics are based in part on initial impressions that I acquired during transcription and in part on other researchers' studies. For example, Gumperz (1982) writes that codeswitching can be used for interjections, reiteration and personalization; Hird (1996) similarly lists reiteration for emphasis, asides and objectivization or personalization as some uses of CS. Adendorff (1996) includes encouragement, solidarity and classroom management as possible uses of language alternation; to this list, Polio and Duff

(1994) add classroom management, administration, vocabulary and interaction effects related to students' use of their L1. With prior research in mind, I kept a running list while transcribing of the sorts of things teachers did with English. Initially, this list was quite long and detailed; it included specific categories such as presentation of new grammar, correction of errors with new material, grammar practice, and review of grammar rules. Preliminary analysis revealed that these categories were overly specific; for example, it was very difficult to determine whether grammatical topics were new or review. Therefore, I collapsed and combined some topics; for example, the above categories were combined into the more general topic of grammar. The topics that I chose to study fall into three larger functions of pedagogical speech, classroom administration, and interpersonal talk. The seven topics of classroom speech considered in this study are grammar explanation and practice; discussion of readings or other cultural content; instructions regarding tests, assignments and class schedules and classroom management; defining or paraphrasing vocabulary; humor; chastising; praise and encouragement. After identifying and categorizing c-units of teachers' talk, I reviewed my categorization on several transcripts in order to verify that I was coding the c-units consistently.

While categorizing I noted information about the context and content of codeswitches; these notations were based mainly on work by Polio and Duff (1994). The additional notations indicated utterances in English that were preceded by student remarks or questions in English, also known as interaction effect; utterances in which teachers more or less directly translated their own

previous utterances, either from German into English or vice versa; intrasentential codeswitches; and flagged codeswitches, that is, language alternation to which teachers drew attention, perhaps by changing their volume or rate of speech or by explicitly stating that they would switch languages. I labeled as intrasentential switches place where German was quoted within English sentence, even if the two languages were not really linguistically integrated. For example, I considered the sentence “You need durch mit von” to contain intrasentential codeswitching, although the teacher was quoting the German words rather than fully integrating them syntactically into the English sentence.

Occasionally the apparent communicative intent of teachers’ utterances was ambiguous. In such cases, I considered the individual utterance, the overall context and the co-text, or talk immediately surrounding the utterance in question, in order to determine the main role of the utterance. For example, the following exchange primarily deals with the content of a short story, but the last two statements deal with grammar; therefore, the second and third c-units in line 5 were classified as grammar, although the rest of the teacher’s utterances in this sample were counted under content.

- 1 T: Was findet der Landarzt? Er macht seine Reise
- 2 Und er findet einen?
- 3 S: Patient
- 4 T: Patienten
- 5 Er findet, it’s weak so it’s Patienten

- 1 T: *What does the country doctor find? He takes a trip*
- 2 *And he finds a?*
- 3 S: *Patient*
- 4 T: *Patient*
- 5 *He finds, it's weak so it's Patienten*

The instructions category overlapped somewhat with both content and grammar categories, as some instructions pertained either to grammatical or cultural topics. I chose to distinguish between instructions strictly related to in-class grammatical or content-based tasks and instructions related to homework due dates or about the general administration of the class. The first of the following examples fell under the category grammar because the directions being given pertain strictly to a grammar-based task; the students were being told how to transform a sentence from the active to the passive voice.

- 1 J: So the tricky part of this is you have to first identify like T
<student name> did what the tense of the original sentence is
- 2 And then keep it in that tense

The second example was classified under instructions because the teacher is discussing homework assignments and the plan for the class hour; although a grammatical topic is mentioned, the goal of these utterances is classroom management and organization, so they were counted as directions.

- 1 J: I'm gonna give you another assignment em which is just writing
some passive sentences em in the different tenses
- 2 We'll go over that after we cover passive

Humor was sometimes difficult to define and categorize. To identify it, I relied first on my own sense of humor and my acquaintance with the teachers and what I understood of their personalities. Humor varies across cultures; quite

possibly, humor serves different functions and is valued in different ways in different cultures (compare, for example, Apte's [1985] cross-cultural look at humor). I examined the way in which utterances were spoken as well as student response; if a teacher or students laughed during or after an utterance, I often categorized it as humor. I also counted as humor utterances that were not themselves meant to be jokes but which were repetitions of funny things that had been previously said. According to Tannen (1989), one interactional function of repetition is savoring a good line; therefore, I counted as humor teachers' utterances which were repetitions of funny statements, either ones they themselves had made or those made by students. Following is one such repetition that I categorized as humor. In this exchange, the grammatical topic passive voice is being practiced. The first student gives the expected reply, a sentence in the active voice; the next student gives an unexpected answer in line 5. The teacher's replies in lines 6 and 8 were categorized as humor because of both her own laughter and the laughter of her students; though she did not make the joke, her repetition suggests that she is enjoying the humor of the situation.

- 1 S: Columbus hat Amerika entdeckt
- 2 R: Sehr gut
- 3 Hat Amerika entdeckt
- 4 Und im Passiv, C <student's name>?
- 5 S: Em, Amerika ist von Columbus getroffen worden
- 6 R: Getroffen ((laughs))
- 7 Ss: ((laughter))
- 8 R: OK, getroffen worden, zufällig, ja

- 1 S: *Columbus discovered America*
- 2 R: *Very good*
- 3 *Discovered America*
- 4 *And in passive, C <student's name>?*
- 5 S: *Em, America was hit by Columbus*
- 6 R: *Hit* ((laughs))
- 7 Ss: ((laughter))
- 8 R: *OK, was hit, by chance, yeah*

After determining, categorizing and counting c-units, I made several calculations in order to compare teachers' use of German and English by category. First, I calculated how each language was divided into functions; that is, I calculated how much of each teacher's English was used to teach grammar, how much for discussion of literature or cultural content, how much for instructions, etc. This calculation was based on the number of c-units in each category divided by the total number of c-units in English. I made the same calculation of the division by topic of teachers' German. For each of my calculations, I considered multiple recordings per instructor together; that is, I added c-units from all class hours for each teacher and considered them together. I also figured how each teacher's total language use was divided by function; here, I considered the number of c-units per category, regardless of language spoken, and divided this by the total number of c-units in either language. This calculation expresses how much each teacher spoke about grammar, content, instructions, etc. regardless of the language used. In order to compare not just c-units but minutes of speech, I used a stopwatch to time teachers' speech, both in English and in German. As with the c-unit analysis, I timed only speech addressed to the entire class, not talk during small group work. Lastly, I

calculated how much of teachers' talk regardless of topic was in English by figuring percentages based on both c-units and minutes. I recorded these numbers in tables, with teachers grouped according to native speaker status to facilitate comparison. Tables of these numeric results are included in the Findings chapter.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSES OF TRANSCRIPTS

In this part of the analysis, I compare the speech in my corpus with the categories of codeswitching identified by previous research. Specifically, I compare my data with Gumperz' typology of the functions of codeswitching (Gumperz 1982); with the functional uses of codeswitching found by Polio and Duff (1994); and with the types of codeswitching identified by Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (Myers-Scotton 1987 & 1988). The first two approaches consider codeswitching primarily in terms of specific interactions; that is, they assume that speakers choose among their languages based on the local dynamics of the current speech situation. However, those individual interactions can also be compared to other interactions. Myers-Scotton suggests that through the quantification of individual choices across groups, patterns can emerge (Myers-Scotton 1993, p. 52); the variation found in individual conversations is not haphazard. Myers-Scotton's approach, in contrast, considers codeswitching to be based on macro-level sociological features of the speaker and the speech situation. It assumes that speakers make language choices based on their knowledge of the norms of markedness that exist in speech communities; that is, Myers-Scotton's approach deals more with speech communities and less with individuals. By

comparing my data to work by these researchers, I seek to determine how widely applicable their functional categories are. That is, my goal was to determine whether the specific functionally defined patterns previously observed by Gumperz and Polio and Duff were valid for this sample as well. By comparing my data to the types of CS identified by Myers-Scotton, I investigate larger patterns of language use so that I can begin to generalize about the macro-level language use patterns of the emerging speech community of foreign language classes. In the comparison of my data to the previously identified CS types, I examine specific exchanges in order to consider how teachers used the languages in their and their students' repertoires in order to accomplish classroom goals. In my analysis, I focus mainly on teachers' speech but also consider other aspects of the context, including students' contributions to class, background information about the teachers and the language program. My acquaintance with the teachers and my experience as a teacher in the department help to flesh out the analysis of the classroom interaction observed. Admittedly, familiarity with the subjects can have drawbacks because of possible biases towards or against certain individuals. However, the use of both numeric and qualitative analyses helped to limit these biases. In fact, some of my first impressions were refuted after completing numeric analyses.

Chapter 4: Findings

My data analysis compares the functional uses of codeswitching found in the current data set with those identified by prior research. I consider both the presence and the absence of such previously identified functions in the current corpus of data. My analysis begins with the categories of a general codeswitching typology presented by Gumperz (1982a). He identifies situational codeswitching and metaphorical CS, which includes the subcategories addressee specification; quotation; interjections; reiteration; qualification; personalization and objectivization. Next, I consider the classroom functions of codeswitching that Polio and Duff (1994) identified in their study of foreign language classrooms in the U.S.: administrative vocabulary; grammar instruction; classroom management; solidarity; English practice by the teacher; translation of unknown target language vocabulary; remedy of lack of student comprehension; and interactive effects based on student use of English. Finally, I consider the applicability of Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (1987 & 1988) to the current data. In the comparison of my data to previous research, I use both numeric analyses based on classifying and counting c-units of teacher speech, and qualitative analyses that describe the interactional functions of codeswitching in classroom discourse.

GUMPERZ' TYPOLOGY OF CODESWITCHING

Situational codeswitching

The first type of codeswitching that Gumperz identifies is situational CS, in which speakers alternate languages when the topic, setting or constellation of speakers changes. In the current sample, the setting of each class hour and the overall constellation of participants remained constant, but the topics of discussion did change and included grammar, literary and cultural content and general instructions.

Analyses of situational CS uncovered noteworthy differences between the native Germans and the American teachers. Namely, native speakers of English engaged in a great deal of situational CS, while native German-speaking teachers did not. (Table 1 below provides percentages of each teacher's use of English and German for different communicative functions, while table 2 summarizes these results by providing mean use of English by function for Americans and Germans.) Both groups engaged in some codeswitching while discussing most topics. However, the Americans in this sample used English more often during discussions of grammar and while giving general instructions than the Germans. (All teachers' functional use of codeswitching for humor, chastising and praise is compared below to Gumperz' category of personalization and objectivization.) The American teachers' switching to English was based quite often on changes in the topic of discussion, while the native German speakers switched to English much less often in response to topic shift.

Table 1: Division of each function among languages

Percentages, based on c-units

Multiple class hours considered together

All names are pseudonyms and are matched for gender

Teacher	Lang.	Grmr.	Cont.	Instr.	Vocab	Humor	Chast.	Praise
Renate	English	12.7	.9	8.1	57	0	0	0
	German	87.3	99.1	91.9	42.9	100	100	100
Bernd	English	3.3	1.9	13.6	12.2	14.4	0	0
	German	96.7	98	86.4	87.8	85.6	100	100
Dieter	English	12.1	1.9	10.1	20	20	0	4.5
	German	87.9	98.1	89.9	80	80	100	95.5
Julie	English	30.6	0	43.3	18.8	67	25	14.3
	German	69.4	100	56.7	81.2	33	75	85.7
Melissa	English	53.9	.5	47.3	11.1	100	0	12.5
	German	46	99.5	52.7	88.9	0	0	87.5
John	English	40.6	0	47.8	10	21.2	0	26.7
	German	59.4	100	52.2	90	78.8	0	73.3
Tom	English	21	22.7	45.8	19	36.4	72.7	46.9
	German	78.9	77.3	54.2	81	63.6	27.3	53.1
Beth	English	17.8	3.0	18.1	74.8	36	57.1	27.3
	German	82.2	97	81.9	25.2	64	42.9	72.7

Key: Grmr = Grammar; Cont. = literary or cultural content; Instr. = instructions

Vocab. = vocabulary; Chast. = chastising

Table 2: Mean use of English by function

Percentage of English by function, divided among German and American teachers

Based on c-unit analysis

	Grmr.	Cont.	Instr.	Vocab	Humor	Chast.	Praise
Germans	9.4	1.6	10.6	29.7	11.5	0	1.5
Americans	32.8	5.2	40.5	26.7	48.7	31	25.5

Several American teachers showed strong tendencies to separate their language choice according to topic, using English rather often for grammar practice and for instructions but almost never for discussions of literature and cultural content. In the following excerpt, John made announcements in English about upcoming films and language tables, which students are required to attend occasionally for course credit; after the announcements, he began a discussion of a literary text. (Here, as in all examples cited, the original transcript is cited first, followed by an English translation. In the English translation, I use italics to indicate where the original language was German.)

1 J: So you might want to start getting that out of the way before
exams start
2 OK, are there any questions about anything, the writing assignment
the orals
3 (.)
4 OK, dann, ich habe wieder geheiratet <this is the name of the story>
5 Wo waren wir stehen geblieben
6 S: I didn't understand the ending
7 J: Sprechen wir über das Ende
8 Erstens was eh, ganz, eine kurze Zusammenfassung
9 Machen wir das schnell, weil wir müssen heute viel—viel machen
heute

1 J: So you might want to start getting that out of the way before
exams start
2 OK, are there any questions about anything, the writing assignment
the orals
3 (.)
4 OK, *now, I've gotten married again* <this is the name of the story>
5 *Where did we stop*
6 S: I didn't understand the ending
7 J: *Let's talk about the ending*
8 *First, what, eh, really, a short summary*
9 *Let's do this quickly, because we have to do a lot today—a lot today*

When a student asked a question in English, John replied in German (line 7). Similarly, in line 9, he uses German to describe his plan for the class hour. In other segments of the class hour, he might have replied or made that statement in either English or in German, but for this teacher, the only permissible language in the literature segment of the class seemed to be German, as he never used English for this purpose. Particularly noteworthy is the way this instructor used the discourse markers OK and *dann* (literally, *then*) to indicate both the shift of topic and the accompanying shift in language. These discourse markers serve as an

indication that this teacher shifted topic and mark the concomitant change in language.

In the following excerpt from a different section of the same course, John also used *dann* to shift focus when there was not a simultaneous language switch. Here, John made the same announcements as in the above example, but this time in German; after the announcements, he began reviewing a grammatical topic.

- 1 J: OK, eh gibt es Fragen zu irgendetwas, über irgendetwas?
- 2 Die Geschichte, Konjunktiv, irgendetwas (.)
- 3 Dann
- 4 Gehen wir mal
- 5 Erstens als eine kleine Wiederholung, eh Konjunktiv

- 1 J: OK, *eh are there questions on anything, about anything?*
- 2 *The story, subjunctive, anything (.)*
- 3 *Now*
- 4 *Let's go*
- 5 *First as a little review, eh subjunctive*

In both classes, the discourse marker *dann* was spoken clearly and was followed by a pause and then an announcement of the topic of the next segment of class, thus indicating a shift in course content or focus; in the second class, however, the change in topic was not accompanied by a language switch. The second example cited is from a class section that met a few hours after the first one; perhaps the teacher had reconsidered his language use in the meantime and had decided that students would be able to understand these announcements in German. It is also possible that perceived differences among the classes' overall German ability influenced John's language choice. In both cases, the word *dann* served as a

marker of both a change in topic and in some cases a simultaneous change in preferred language of discourse.

Not all teachers showed such a clear demarcation between topics and preferred languages of discourse as did John. Julie, an American, also used considerably more English while discussing grammar than while discussing literary or cultural content, but she did not separate the two languages as strictly as John did and alternated frequently between German and English when discussing grammatical topics. In the following example, Julie gave directions for a task requiring students to provide the appropriate preposition in sentences written in passive voice.

- 1 J: Wer, wer kann den den ersten Satz lesen und irgendeine
Präposition hineintun?
- 2 (.)
- 3 Matt, lies bitte den ersten Satz für uns
- 4 S: Lange Arbeiten werden meistens (.) uh
- 5 J: Durch, mit, oder von
- 6 S: Durch?
- 7 J: (.) OK Einem=
- 8 S: =Durch einem Computer geschrieben werden
- 9 J: OK, um, eine Hinweise
- 10 Wenn du, ich glaube, du weißt nicht, welche, und das war,
- 11 Das war irgendein, ein Griff Griff auf aus der Luft,
- 12 Aber es steht da, einem
- 13 S: Um
- 14 J: Also, einem ist which which case?
- 15 S: Dative
- 16 J: Dative
- 17 And one of these up there, only one isn't dative
- 18 S: Durch
- 19 J: The one you chose
- 20 So probably not durch
- 21 Durch is like an agent, an agent of nature

- 1 J: *Who, who can read the the first sentence and put in any preposition?*
- 2 (.)
- 3 Matt, *please read the first sentence for us*
- 4 S: *Long essays are usually (.) uh*
- 5 J: *By, with or by* <three different prepositions are presented in German>
- 6 S: *By?*
- 7 J: (.) OK, *a=*
- 8 S: *=Are written by a computer*
- 9 J: OK, *um, a tip*
- 10 *If you, I think, you don't know which one*
- 11 *And that was, that was a guess guess out of thin air*
- 12 *But it says there, einem (a)*
- 13 S: *Um*
- 14 J: *So, einem (a) is which which case?*
- 15 S: *Dative*
- 16 J: *Dative*
- 17 *And one of these up there, only one isn't dative*
- 18 S: *Durch*
- 19 J: *The one you chose*
- 20 *So probably not durch*
- 21 *Durch is like an agent, an agent of nature*

Although Julie began leading the grammar exercise in German, she switched to English in line 14 after it had become clear that the student did not know the correct answer. She then used English to provide strategies for completing the grammatical task. This instructor followed this pattern many times in the hours I observed her; that is, she began grammar practices in German but often switched to English in order to clarify rules or suggest strategies before returning to German. This excerpt demonstrates this teacher's alternating use of both English and German for grammatical content.

The American teachers in this sample used more English than the German teachers to give their classes instructions about in-class tasks and about

assignments, as shown in Tables 1 and 2 above. The examples discussed below illustrate that not only the topic of instructions influenced teachers' code choice; the language of the surrounding talk on different topics also had an effect on instructors' language choice. In the first excerpt below, Melissa, an American, announced her intention to introduce a new grammatical topic, relative clauses.

- 1 M: Relative clauses, I know you've been waiting for these forever
- 2 You've wanted to do them for so long
- 3 We won't get really to them a whole lot today
- 4 But let's just get started with them so that you can use them like
crazy, OK

This meta-talk about grammar was classified under instructions rather than under grammar because the teacher was not yet explaining the grammatical topic but talking about her plan for how the topic would be covered in class. She talked about the need to learn and use relative clauses but did not yet address how to form them. Although these lines were classified as instructions, they were surrounded by grammar talk. The previous section of class was devoted to practice of the subjunctive; much of that talk was in English. The next portion of the class hour dealt explicitly with relative clauses, and English was used frequently here as well. The proximity to talk in English about grammar might have contributed to the teacher's choice of English for these instructions.

At other times, the same teacher also used German to give instructions. In the following passage, Melissa asked students to form groups in order to discuss a short story.

1 M: Bildet bitte, Gruppen, ja
2 Es gibt eine Gruppe von drei
3 Und ich möchte dass ihr diese Fragen beantwortet, ja
4 Einfach nur so
5 Ihr braucht nichts aufzuschreiben
6 Ja, einfach die Fragen beantworten miteinander
7 Also steht bitte auf und findet einander

1 M: *Form groups, please, yeah*
2 *There is one group of three*
3 *And I would like you to answer these questions, yeah*
4 *Just like that*
5 *You don't need to write anything down*
6 *Yeah, simply answer the questions with each other*
7 *So please stand up and find your groups*

Here, the instructions are in German, and the surrounding talk is also in German. The talk that preceded and followed the excerpt cited above centered on the students' experience of gender roles in their families and their notions about ideal mates; such topics were relevant to the short story that was discussed immediately afterwards. Although the passage above was categorized under instructions, it was surrounded by talk about fiction and other content. Perhaps the instructions were discursively perceived as part of the surrounding context, namely as part of the discussion of literary content.

Native speakers of German also used English for some instructions but much less frequently, in part due to their overall lower rate of English use. In the following examples, Renate, a German native speaker, gave instructions on various topics in German; in the first example, she introduced a grammar exercise.

1 R: OK, nehmt bitte dieses Arbeitsblatt das ich euch gegeben habe
2 Und zwar ist es eine Übung zum Passiv
3 Ihr habt hier eine Tabelle mit drei Spalten
4 Ihr habt in der ersten Spalte den Agenten
5 Was ist der Agent?

1 R: *OK, please take this worksheet that I gave you*
2 *Namely, it is an exercise on passive*
3 *You have here a table with three columns*
4 *You have the agent in the first column*
5 *What is the agent?*

In lines 1-3, Renate instructed students to get out a specific worksheet that she had distributed earlier in the class hour; in lines 4-5, she began discussing the details of the exercise the students were to do. During the grammar practice that follows, she used some English, but her directions introducing the task were in German. Later in the class hour, Renate prepared her students to discuss a short story and similarly used German exclusively. Here, she asked students to count off around the room in order to form groups, then to find their group members in order to start discussing the story.

1 R: OK, sehr gut, perfekt
2 Gruppe eins arbeitet mit A <name>
3 Zwei K <name>, drei, L <name>, vier G <name>
4 Geht jetzt bitte in eure Gruppen
5 Ihr braucht eure Bücher

1 R: *OK, very good, perfect*
2 *Group one works with A <name>*
3 *Two K <name>, three, L <name>, four G <name>*
4 *Please get in your groups now*
5 *You need your books*

Here, too, Renate used German for directions related to a reading text, as she did with directions related to a grammar exercise. The language of this teacher's directions did not vary according to topic; all of Renate's directions were in German, whether they introduced grammatical or cultural tasks. This teacher's use of German for instructions provides additional support to the claim that native-speaking German teachers used German almost exclusively, with less codeswitching motivated by topic shift than was seen with the American teachers.

Metaphorical codeswitching

In metaphorical codeswitching, speakers switch languages in order to evoke a different mood or change their footing with respect to other speakers. This type of CS has several subtypes, in which languages are alternated for the functions of addressee specification, quotation, interjections, reiteration, qualification, and personalization and objectification. The presence of each of these functions is considered in turn below.

Addressee specification

Gumperz' notion of CS serving to include certain listeners and exclude others was not found in the current data set. All learners and teachers studied here shared the same languages; no one speaker could have been specifically excluded or included by codeswitching because almost all of the learners are native speakers of English and they typically speak about the same level of German as well. Because of these shared languages, teachers could not use CS to

specifically address certain students while excluding others. Teachers did call on specific students to respond to questions or to ask questions of their own, but such turn allotments were not typically accomplished through codeswitching. In the following example, Julie, an American, began a grammar exercise by eliciting a volunteer; she used German both to begin the exercise and to choose the next speaker.

- 1 J: OK, also gehen wir einfach durch das Zimmer
- 2 Wer möchte beginnen?
- 3 Wer hat eine Antwort für Nummer eins,
- 4 und wir beginnen mit dieser Person
- 5 Ja, Brian, hast du eine Antwort für eins?
- 6 Kannst du einfach den Satz lesen?
- 7 S: Mit dem Computer?
- 8 J: Em aber lies den ganzen Satz, ja?

- 1 J: OK, *so let's simply go through the room*
- 2 *Who would like to begin?*
- 3 *Who has an answer for number one,*
- 4 *And we'll begin with this person*
- 5 *Yes, Brian, do you have an answer for us?*
- 6 *Can you simply read the sentence?*
- 7 S: *With a computer?*
- 8 J: Em *but read the whole sentence, OK?*

The above pattern is typical of the teachers studied. When instructors addressed individual students, they did not switch languages to do so, instead using whichever language they were speaking at the time. Therefore, codeswitching was not used for addressee specification in this sample.

Quotation

This use of CS was not observed in my data. Teachers did occasionally cite or paraphrase the short stories that they discussed with their classes, but they

typically did not alternate languages in order to indicate where the quotations began. Because such quotations in German typically appeared within discussions of literary content, during which teachers generally spoke German, there was no codeswitching to indicate quotations. Very little other quotations were observed; teachers rarely, if ever, quoted others' speech in the class sessions that I observed. The following example is typical of the way teachers incorporated quotations from literature into their classes. Here, John introduced a passage from the short story his class was discussing.

1 J: Lesen wir vielleicht nur einen kleinen (.) Abschnitt
 2 und zwar auf bei Zeile 145, auf 334 (xxx) Zeile 145
 3 Uh, (.) ich lese das (xxx)
 4 (...)
 5 Er macht ein Projekt über den zweiten Weltkrieg
 6 Und jetzt sprechen sie beim Abendessen in dieser Szene
 7 Zeile hundertfünfundvierzig
 8 Ein paar Wochen später kam er nach Hause, holte aus seiner
 Schulmappe ein paar Papiere und legte sie vor mir auf den
 Küchentisch <reads from text>
 9 Es waren alte Dokumente
 10 Kennst du eine Familie Kolleg fragte er mich

1 J: *Let's read just a small excerpt*
 2 *Namely on at line 145, on 334 (xxx) line 145*
 3 *Uh (.) I'll read it (xxx)*
 4 *(...)*
 5 *He's doing a project about the second world war*
 6 *And now they're talking at dinner in this scene*
 7 *Line 145*
 8 *A few weeks later he came home, took a few papers out of his*
schoolbag and laid them before me on the kitchen table <reads from
text>
 9 *They were old documents*
 10 *Do you know the Kolleg family he asked me*

John introduced the quotation by stating that he would read an excerpt and by telling students where he would start reading. He then situated the quotation by paraphrasing the previous events from the story before he started reading. Such remarks in German served to indicate that what he read was from the text and was not his own words; codeswitching was not used to mark quotations, contrary to Gumperz's findings.

Interjections

Interjections were found infrequently in the current data set but examples such as the following suggest that there are differences between the Germans and the Americans studied. Both groups appeared to use their native languages for interjections, which means that interjections sometimes were in a language other than that of the surrounding talk. In the first example, Beth reviewed a grammatical point with her class, namely, prepositions and the grammatical cases required with them.

- 1 S: Ich tanze um ein Baum
- 2 B: OK, is it gibt es nur ein Baum?
- 3 Und wir tanzen um? ((walks around the table to demonstrate))
- 4 Ich bleibe, hier
- 5 S: (xxx)
- 6 B: Und ich tanze um
- 7 S: Einem Baum
- 8 B: Ja
- 9 S: Ist um ein zweiweg?
- 10 B: OH NO, wait
- 11 S: Durch für gegen ohne um
- 12 B: I was thinking it sounded weird to say it was dem but then I
(xxx)

- 1 S: *I dance around a tree*
- 2 B: OK, *is it is there only one tree?*
- 3 *And we dance around?* ((walks around the table to demonstrate))
- 4 *I stay, here*
- 5 S: (xxx)
- 6 B: *And I dance around*
- 7 S: A tree
- 8 B: *Yes*
- 9 S: *Is <the preposition> around a two-way?*
- 10 B: OH NO, wait
- 11 S: *Through for against without around <list of prepositions>*
- 12 B: I was thinking it sounded weird to say it was *dem* but then I
(xxx)

In correcting a student's error, she made a mistake herself; she misremembered the case required by the preposition *um* and therefore was trying to elicit an incorrect response. Most of this grammar lesson was in German; however, when the teacher realized she had made a mistake (line 10), she expressed her surprise in English, her native language. Both her language switch and the increased volume of the words *oh no* suggest that this utterance was an interjection and not a calm, controlled correction. This American teacher switched to her native language to make such an interjection.

Dieter, a German native speaker, similarly used his native language for brief interjections. In this excerpt, a student got out many props before beginning a cultural presentation.

- 1 D: Aber jetzt fangen wir ganz schnell mal an mit unseren kurzen Präsentationen
- 2 Der Chris hat so viele Sachen dabei
- 3 Ich bin schon gespannt, was das ist, OK Chris
- 4 (...) <student gets up, gets things out for presentation>
- 5 Wau <Ger pronunciation> (...)
- 6 OK, fang an

- 1 D: But let's get started right away with our short presentations
- 2 *Chris has so many things with him*
- 3 *I'm curious to see what it is, OK Chris*
- 4 (...) <student gets up, gets things out for presentation>
- 5 *Wow (...)*
- 6 *OK, get started*

Immediately preceding this excerpt, Dieter used German to tell the class about his lesson plan; the above passage was followed by a student presentation in German. This German teacher was surprised when he saw how many props his student had brought with him, and he expressed that amazement using his native language. Because the rest of his instructions were in German, he did not alternate languages to express his surprise. Based on the interjections present in the current data, then, it appears that interjections are not necessarily a reason for codeswitching, depending on the teacher's native language; the teachers observed seemed to use their native language more often than their second language for such exclamations.

Reiteration

Some teachers in this sample codeswitched between German and English in order to express the same notion two different ways. That is, some teachers translated or paraphrased themselves in English after first saying something in German, and vice versa. The American and the native German teachers codeswitched in order to reiterate their messages at similar rates, with the native Germans codeswitching for this purpose slightly more often; however, the

Americans' reiterations were typically lengthier than those of the Germans. Tables 3 and 4 present the relative frequency of such self-translation for individuals and groups.

Table 3: Self-translation in raw numbers and percentages

Based on only English

Raw numbers of c-units in English

Percentages based on raw numbers over total English c-units spoken

Teacher	self-translation
Renate	0
Bernd	19 (12.9%)
Dieter	10 (8.9%)
Julie	11 (3.4%)
Melissa	8 (2.7%)
John	30 (4.7%)
Tom	29 (15.2%)
Beth	5 (2.7%)

Table 4: Means for self-translation for each group of native speakers, based on percentages

Group of teachers	self-translation
Germans	7.3
Americans	5.7

In the first example of reiteration, Tom, an American, began a discussion of a short story by asking if students had specific questions about the text.

- 1 S: Ich habe sie gelesen aber ich habe nicht (xxx), verstanden?
- 2 T: Verstanden, ja
- 3 Das war ziemlich schwierig
- 4 Habt ihr, gibt es hier besondere Stellen die wir jetzt nah lesen könnten
- 5 Are there particular parts here that you marked that were particularly difficult, that we can go over right now

- 1 S: *I read it but I didn't (xxx) understand?*
- 2 T: *Understand, yes*
- 3 *It was rather difficult*
- 4 *Do you have, are there particular sections that we could read closely now*
- 5 Are there particular parts here that you marked that were particularly difficult, that we can go over right now

Tom asked first in German, then in English whether students had understood the short story they had read. This teacher translated himself often, typically without pausing before switching languages in order to repeat his message. His language

alternation is an example of accommodation to the learners; he switched to their native language in response to the perceived difficulty of the short story. Zéphir and Chirol's (1993) survey of teaching assistants' (TAs) and foreign language students' attitudes toward classroom target language use found that some TAs ascribed worries to their students that the student surveys did not bear out; in other words, some TA's may have been overaccommodating, using simpler language or more English than was necessary or than students wanted. Giles, Coupland and Coupland (1991) describe accommodation as a way to index and achieve solidarity with interlocutors. Tom's reiteration of his message, without any demonstrated student misunderstanding, suggests that he accommodated to what he perceived to be his students' preferred language.

Other teachers' codeswitching for reiteration was motivated by students' misunderstandings. In the following example, Julie, an American, had given her students a two-part exercise using the passive voice. First, they were to use the active voice to rephrase rules written in the passive voice; they were then to create their own classroom rules using the passive voice. She explained the exercise in great detail in German, gave examples and paraphrased necessary vocabulary before having students complete the task in small groups. Despite her explanation of the task in German, students had questions once they began working.

- 1 S: Are we supposed to write this in active?
- 2 J: Und dann noch ein paar Schilder schreiben, zwei oder so
- 3 Ein Schild, a sign
- 4 Make your own sign
- 5 Make your own rule

- 1 S: Are we supposed to write this in active?
- 2 J: *And then write a couple of signs, two or so*
- 3 *A sign, a sign*
- 4 Make your own sign
- 5 Make your own rule

This teacher reiterated her directions in English because she perceived that her lengthy German explanations had not been understood. That is, she attempted to express herself comprehensibly in German, paraphrased her directions and gave examples in German. Once it was clear that not all students had understood the instructions, she used English to give a concise summary of the task. Here, Julie's reiterative codeswitching was motivated by observed student misunderstanding.

The German teachers also reiterated their message by alternating languages, but for different purposes than the Americans. Such codeswitching by Germans seems to have been influenced often by students' use of English, as we see in the following two examples. In the first one, Bernd's students had played a game in which students described animals so that the others could guess what the animals were. One student compared an owl to the CNN talk show host Larry King, which Bernd did not understand because he did not have cable TV.

- 1 S: Und eh Larry King, he looks like an owl
- 2 B: Oh, OK, alles klar
- 3 S: (xxx)
- 4 B: Ja, ich verstehe
- 5 Gut, also repeat after me
- 6 Wiederholt mir bitte <reads vocabulary from book>

- 1 S: Und eh Larry King, he looks like an owl
- 2 B: Oh, OK, *that's clear*
- 3 S: (xxx)
- 4 B: *Yes, I understand*
- 5 *Good, so repeat after me*
- 6 *Please repeat after me* <reads vocabulary from book>

Bernd's initial response to the student's English was to use German to confirm that he understood what the student meant. In line 5, however, he used English to request that students repeat the new vocabulary, followed immediately by the same request in German. His brief use of English was influenced by the student's use of English a few moments earlier. In this case, he surely did not use English because of the difficulty of the content of his message, since students in fourth-semester level courses are familiar with this common classroom request. His switch to English helped to focus the class's attention back to the task Bernd wanted to complete, namely a review of the vocabulary. His use of English helped to demarcate the end of that discussion; his reiteration of his request in German confirmed his desire to speak primarily German in class.

In the following example, Dieter similarly reiterated his message in English for reasons other than misunderstanding among students. Here, he had just asked his students to pass around a bar of German chocolate that he had brought for them.

1 S: Where did you find that because (xxx)
 2 D: Germany
 3 In Deutschland habe ich das gekauft
 4 (xxx) schauen wie viel wir sind=
 5 S: =(xxx) that kind
 6 D: Wir sind heute so viele Leute OK
 7 S: (xxx)
 8 (.)
 9 S: I knew there was a reason I came to class today
 10 ((laughter))
 11 D: (We have to) count first
 12 (xxx) zählen OK
 13 Eins zwei drei vier fünf sechs sieben acht
 14 Vielleicht manche von euch müssen eins teilen, ja

1 S: Where did you find that because (xxx)
 2 D: Germany
 3 *In Germany I bought it*
 4 (xxx) *see how many of us there are =*
 5 S: =(xxx) that kind
 6 D: *There are so many of us today* OK
 7 S: (xxx)
 8 (.)
 9 S: I knew there was a reason I came to class today
 10 ((laughter))
 11 D: (We have to) count first
 12 (xxx) *count* OK
 13 *One two three four five six seven eight*
 14 *Maybe some of you will have to share one, yeah*

The first example of reiteration occurs in lines 2-3; in line 2, Dieter replied in English to a question in English but then repeated the content of his response in German. In lines 11-12, he similarly used English first, followed by a German reiteration; this time, his goal was to make sure that the students shared the chocolate in such a way that everyone got a piece. He might have used English because he needed to get students' attention quickly, before they started passing

around the chocolate. His quick return to English in both instances reflects his overall pattern of using primarily German during class; his English was a brief sidestep, perhaps invoked by students' use of English, which he then remedied by repeating his message in German.

In the above examples, we see that both American and German teachers used codeswitching for reiteration of their message. Such self-translation reflects an awareness of the effect of language choice on their students' learning and on effective classroom communication. There was little difference between the two groups based on percentages of overall English use. However, they did differ in which language they used first: the American teachers tended to speak German first, followed by English, while the order of languages for the Germans was the reverse. Moreover, the American teachers tended to switch in response to perceived student misunderstandings while the Germans' use of English was typically motivated by student language choice.

Qualification

When speakers codeswitch for message qualification, the main content is expressed in one language, while additional explanation or detail is given in another. This phenomenon was observed infrequently among the teachers studied. More often, instructors gave directions mainly or entirely in a single language, without any codeswitching. However, both German and American teachers used codeswitching for message qualification. In the following excerpt, Renate, a German, codeswitched in order to explain an activity in which each

student was to describe an object in such a way that the other students could guess what it was.

1 R: Ihr sollt das für die anderen Studenten beschreiben mit so einem Satz
2 Und die anderen Studenten müssen raten was das ist
3 Was ist raten?
4 S: Guess
5 R: To guess, OK, sehr gut
6 Und macht das nach diesem Muster
7 Sagt zuerst was es ist
8 %OK, it's a kind of food or a kind of beverage or something%
9 Und dann sagt, wo, wo das, gegessen wird oder, gemacht wird oder getragen wird

1 R: *You should describe that for the other students with this kind of sentence*
2 *And the other students have to guess what it is*
3 *What is raten?*
4 S: Guess
5 R: To guess, OK, very good
6 *And follow this pattern*
7 *Say first what it is*
8 %OK, it's a kind of food or a kind of beverage or something%
9 *And then say, where where it is eaten or, is done or is worn*

The class had previously completed one example together, during which some students seemed not to understand how they were to define the object. That is, they did not realize that the instructor wanted them to first identify the object as a food or beverage. In this passage, most of Renate's instructions were in German; she switched to English in order to make those directions more specific because of perceived need to clarify her directions.

American teachers of German also occasionally qualified their messages in response to perceived lack of comprehension. In the following passage, Tom codeswitched in order to qualify some of his directions for group work.

1 T: Und versucht in der Gruppe, einfach zu erzählen
2 Ja, mach eine Erzählung, eine einfache Erzählung
3 Was passiert hier
4 OK, so try to help each other
5 You can all contribute, what did you understand
6 What did you understand
7 And try from your different perspectives to build a narrative
8 OK, what happens in the story, OK

1 T: *And in your groups, try to simply tell*
2 *Yes, make a narrative, a simple narrative*
3 *What happens here*
4 OK, so try to help each other
5 You can all contribute, what did you understand
6 What did you understand
7 And try from your different perspectives to build a narrative
8 OK, what happens in the story, OK

This teacher switched languages in line 4 in order to provide more precise directions for the task. Since he did not wait before switching to English, there is no way of knowing whether students would have understood his German directions. However, his earlier statements that the text was difficult suggest that his switching here was motivated by the perceived difficulty of both the short story and the students' task. Moreover, his qualification of the message in English contained more detail than his initial instructions in German and seemed to suggest that the task was not too complicated and the students working together would not have much difficulty with it. Such message qualification served both

to clarify directions and to encourage students that they would be able to perform the task successfully.

Personalization and objectivization

In Gumperz' typology, speakers may codeswitch in order to make their message more personal or more objective. By alternating languages, speakers can express their emotional involvement with the content and their interlocutors or they can distance themselves from the subject matter and other speakers. Such functional use of CS was present in the current sample. In my analysis, I considered instances of what I called humor, praise and encouragement, and chastising, and I believe these classifications to be analogous to the personalization and objectification that Gumperz identifies. Tables 5 and 6 below provide numeric data which demonstrate the relative frequency of such uses of English and German among the teachers studied here. From this numeric data it is apparent that the American teachers used English overall much more often than German for the social functions of humor, praise and encouragement and chastising; they also used English much more often for these functions than the German native speakers did. The following excerpts illustrate the ways that the teachers studied engaged in codeswitching for these interpersonal functions.

Table 5: Percentages of interpersonal functions divided among German and English

Teacher	Language	Humor	Praise/ Encourage- ment	Chastising
Renate	English	0	0	0
	German	100	100	100
Bernd	English	14.4	0	0
	German	85.6	100	100
Dieter	English	20	4.5	0
	German	80	95.5	100
Julie	English	67	14.3	25
	German	33	85.7	75
Melissa	English	100	12.5	0
	German	0	87.5	0
John	English	21.2	26.7	0
	German	78.8	73.3	0
Tom	English	36.4	46.9	72.7
	German	63.6	53.1	27.3
Beth	English	36	27.3	57.1
	German	64	72.7	42.9

Table 6: Mean use of English for interpersonal functions, divided among Germans and Americans

	Humor	Praise/ Encourag- ement	Chastising
Germans	11.5	1.5	0
Americans	48.7	25.5	31

The American teachers in this sample alternated languages in order to share humor and express their solidarity to their students, whose native language they share. Codeswitching researchers such as Adendorff (1996) and Ogaine (1997) discuss the ways that learners and teachers use their L1 for social as well as educational functions; while they do not discuss humor specifically, I believe that joking in the students' native language is one way that learners and teachers can express their solidarity and build a sense of team spirit in the classroom. In the first example, Tom discussed idiomatic combinations of verbs and prepositions with his class when a student asked about the logic of such combinations.

1 S: Is there any trick to remember like which verbs go with which
preposition or
2 T: No
3 S: (xxx)
4 T: M <student name>, you're so naï ve
5 S: ((laughs))
6 T: No
7 S: I thought maybe I was missing something
8 T: ((laughs)) Eh, no, there's no (cliff notes)
9 No, em man muss die einfach em auswendig lernen
10 Das ist leider so

1 S: Is there any trick to remember like which verbs go with which
preposition or
2 T: No
3 S: (xxx)
4 T: M <student name>, you're so naï ve
5 S: ((laughs))
6 T: No
7 S: I thought maybe I was missing something
8 T: ((laughs)) Eh, no, there's no (cliff notes)
9 No, em *you have to simply memorize them*
10 *That's just the way it is, unfortunately*

Tom answered the grammar question in a teasing way, but he later responds more seriously in German that there are some patterns to such idioms but that learners must memorize most of them. His initial kidding in English suggests that he understands the student's frustration with learning these idioms; since he had to learn them himself, he appreciates the difficulty of the task. Harder (1980) discusses the reduced role that foreign language learners play in interaction; because their proficiency is still developing, they cannot express every aspect of their personalities that they could in their native languages. The same might be said about their ability to comprehend all aspects of others'

personalities: if Tom had joked in German, the students might not have understood. Tom's switch to English can be explained as a means to convey humor and present a side of his personality that students might not have appreciated had he expressed it in their L2.

The American teachers studied also codeswitched in order to praise and encourage their students. The majority of praise in this data set consists of short comments in German, typically one or two words, e.g., *gut*, *sehr gut*, *schön*; occasionally the English equivalents of these expressions, *good*, *very good*, and *nice* were also used. Typically, approval was expressed in German, sometimes even when the surrounding talk was in English, as in the following example. Here, Melissa instructed her class to close their books in preparation for a quiz and reminded them about where their oral exams were to take place that day.

- 1 M: OK, alles bitte weg und zu <begins to distribute quiz>
- 2 Don't forget your oral exams today
- 3 Super gemacht heute, sehr gut
- 4 Alles was wir gemacht haben war ziemlich schwer
- 5 S: Are the oral exams going to be (xxx)
- 6 M: E.P. Schoch, yeah, we'll just come and get you
- 7 So just come up to the fourth floor

- 1 M: OK, *please put away and shut everything* <begins to distribute quiz>
- 2 Don't forget your oral exams today
- 3 *Great job today, very good*
- 4 *Everything that we did today was rather hard*
- 5 S: Are the oral exams going to be (xxx)
- 6 M: E.P. Schoch, yeah, we'll just come and get you
- 7 So just come up to the fourth floor

This passage is noteworthy because Melissa alternated several times between German and English. She used English for announcements and instructions, as many of the American teachers did. In contrast, Melissa used German to convey her pleasure at the students' accomplishments precisely because the students had done such a good job speaking and using German during the day's lesson. Using their shared native language, English, might have detracted from the admiration she wanted to express. In choosing the target language for her praise, Melissa emphasized how well the students were able to communicate in German. The fact that she switched languages at all drew extra attention to her praise. The specific language used may not have been as significant as her codeswitching; the language alternation helped to emphasize her communicative intent by drawing attention to those utterances.

Teachers also engaged in codeswitching in order to encourage their students and to prompt responses from them. In the next example, Beth used English to elicit historical information from her students in order to contextualize the poem they had just discussed; the switch to English served to jump-start a stalled discussion.

- 1 B: Also Kästner hat das in 1933 geschrieben
- 2 Was passierte neu-dreiunddreißig in Deutschland?
- 3 (.)
- 4 B: What was going on
- 5 (.)
- 6 Just to kind of put this in perspective (xxx)
- 7 S: The depression? Late 1933?
- 8 B: Armut, ja
- 9 S: Die Nazis bekommen die Macht

- 1 B: *So Kästner wrote this in 1933*
- 2 *What happened in Germany in nine—thirty-three?*
- 3 (.)
- 4 B: What was going on
- 5 (.)
- 6 Just to kind of put this in perspective (xxx)
- 7 S: The depression? Late 1933?
- 8 B: *Poverty, yes*
- 9 S: *The Nazis get power*

Although the class had discussed this era earlier in the semester, her initial question went unanswered. After a pause with no response, she rephrased the question in English, this time getting a response from students. A student responded in English to her question in English, but Beth returned immediately to German, and the next student to speak also used German. Thus Beth's brief use of English helped to elicit student responses. In addition, her words *just* and *kind of* in line 6 helped to mitigate the request, that is, to play down the difficulty of it and to reassure students that her expectations of them were reasonable. Both the language alternation and the specific words used prompted student response.

Tom, another American, similarly used English to elicit a response from his students after initially asking a question in German.

- 1 T: Jetzt machen wir eine Zusammenfassung
- 2 Noch, wie wie eh Adam gemacht hat
- 3 Was ist what's what's our context
- 4 What is, what happens, what's the narrative
- 5 Just the let's make a very elementary list
- 6 Landarzt, muss, was? ((writes on board))
- 7 S: Ein Pferd finden

- 1 T: *Now let's make a summary*
- 2 *Again, like, like eh Adam did*
- 3 *What is what's what's our context*
- 4 *What is, what happens, what's the narrative*
- 5 *Just the let's make a very elementary list*
- 6 *Country doctor, must, what?* ((writes on board))
- 7 S: *Find a horse*

In contrast to Beth, Tom did not wait to see if students would respond to his request to summarize a short story before he asked a related question in English. After explaining what he wanted in both German and English, he asked simple questions in German in order to elicit student responses. On the surface, the intent of Tom's request in English is a call for students to share what they understood about the short story that they read. In addition, his use of words such as *just* and *very elementary* in line 5 suggest that he had reasonable, attainable expectations in the target language. Prior to this exchange, the students and the teacher had spoken of the difficulty of the text and the students' sense of not having understood it. Tom's use of these words seemed to reassure students that the current task could be managed although the text was difficult to read. Both the language alternation and the word choice conveyed reassurance while encouraging student participation.

American teachers did not always alternate languages in order to elicit student participation in discussions. The following example shows John using German to reassure and encourage his students, much as Tom and Beth used English above. Here, John discussed a short story with his class in German; he asked his students to describe the relationship of two characters but got few responses.

1 J: Nur ein bisschen beschreiben
 2 Ich suche kein keine eine keine einzige Antwort
 3 Beschreiben wir einfach die Beziehung
 4 Es ist keine Eifersucht
 5 (.)
 6 Wie ist es?
 7 S: (Practical)
 8 J: OK, wie sagt man das
 9 S: Praktisch
 10 J: Praktisch, praktisch oder pragmatisch
 11 Was noch?
 12 (.)
 13 Ganz einfache Wörter benutzen
 14 Es muss nichts Großartiges sein
 15 S: Frei
 16 J: Frei, frei, offen, ohne wie (sie da einfach) beschreibt
 17 Ohne Misstrauen, ohne Anspielungen über Moral etc. etc.

1 J: *Just describe a little*
 2 *I'm not looking for any any single answer*
 3 *Let's simply describe their relationship*
 4 *There is no jealousy*
 5 (.)
 6 *How is it?*
 7 S: (Practical)
 8 J: OK, *how do you say that*
 9 S: *Practical*
 10 J: *Practical, practical or pragmatic*
 11 *What else?*
 12 (.)
 13 *Use very simple words*
 14 *It doesn't need to be anything great*
 15 S: *Free*
 16 J: *Free, free, open, without as she describes*
 17 *Without mistrust, without allusions to morality etc etc*

At several points within this exchange, John encouraged his students to contribute to the discussion. His use of the German words *ein bisschen* and *einfach* parallel Tom's and Beth's use of *just* and *very elementary*. All three teachers used such

words to reassure students that the task was within their ability. While Tom and Beth used English for this purpose, John used German. Such variability among these teachers suggests that both languages can be used to personalize messages and to express solidarity and encouragement; these functions can be accomplished either monolingually or through codeswitching. However, American teachers used English more frequently for these interpersonal functions than their German counterparts did.

Not all codeswitching worked to bring students and teachers emotionally closer together, however; sometimes English was also used to reprimand students. Teachers did not chastise their students very often, in either English or German. In the following example, Tom used English to scold his students for not having their textbooks with them.

- 1 T: OK, from now on for the rest of the semester, read the syllabus
((taps fist on lecturn))
- 2 OK? And listen to what I say in class
- 3 Because sometimes I change the syllabus
- 4 I announce it in class
- 5 I write it on the board
- 6 And you completely waste my time if you don't come with the stuff
that you're supposed to have, OK

After the scolding, classroom talk continued in German: a few students apologized, the teacher announced his plan for the class hour, and class continued. Here, the students' and teacher's native language served to clearly express the teacher's dissatisfaction with his students and thus to distance himself from them. His use of his and the students' native language also ensured that he conveyed the appropriate level of firmness, which might not have been the case in the second

language. After the scolding, he resumed speaking German, which was a more neutral and official language after this rebuke.

Summary of Gumperz's functions of codeswitching

Many of the functions of codeswitching that Gumperz identified are also found in the current sample. The teachers studied used alternated languages when the situation or topic changed, and they also used codeswitching for interjections, reiteration, qualification and personalization and objectivization. Gumperz's functions of addressee specification and quotiation were not seen in this sample. Addressee specification was not accomplished through codeswitching because all members of the class spoke some degree of both possible languages; quotations were likewise not accomplished through codeswitching, as most quotations consisted of passages from German literary texts that were discussed in German. There was variation among teachers' use of codeswitching for the functions that were observed. The American teachers codeswitched more often in response to topic shift and thus engaged in more situational codeswitching than did Germans. The American teachers also switched to English more often than their German counterparts for interpersonal functions, that is, to personalize and objectivize their messages. Although not every one of Gumperz's functions of codeswitching was identified in the current study, the language alternation found here is in many ways comparable to that in Gumperz's work. Although the speech communities he studied and the one I

looked at are different, they can both be described in similar terms, using the same functional categories of CS.

POLIO AND DUFF'S CLASSROOM FUNCTIONS OF CS

The next part of my analysis uses the functional categories of codeswitching identified by Polio and Duff (1994) as a guideline. In their study of language alternation in teachers' speech in university foreign language classes, they identified several functions of classroom talk for which teachers tended to use the students' native language, namely, administrative vocabulary, grammar, classroom management, solidarity, English practice by the teacher, translation of unknown target language vocabulary, remedy of lack of student understanding, and interactive effects based on students' use of their L1. There are a few important differences between their study and my own. First, they studied only teachers who were native speakers of the languages they taught; the target languages of the classes that they studied in depth included German, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, Hebrew and an unnamed Slavic language. Second, they studied talk in second-semester classes, as compared to the third- and fourth-semester classes studied here. Finally, they also did not compare the relative frequency of the functions that emerged in their data. Nevertheless, the functions of codeswitching that they identify are relevant for the current study because they, too, are based on interaction in university foreign language classes in the United States. For the reader's convenience, I reproduce the numeric data on the division of functions among languages here. Interpretations of these numbers appears in the following sections.

Table 7: Division of each function among languages

Percentages, based on c-units

Key: Grmr = Grammar; Cont. = literary or cultural content; Instr. = instructions

Vocab. = vocabulary; Chast. = chastising

Teacher	Lang.	Grmr.	Cont.	Instr.	Vocab	Humor	Chast.	Praise
Renate	English	12.7	.9	8.1	57	0	0	0
	German	87.3	99.1	91.9	42.9	100	100	100
Bernd	English	3.3	1.9	13.6	12.2	14.4	0	0
	German	96.7	98	86.4	87.8	85.6	100	100
Dieter	English	12.1	1.9	10.1	20	20	0	4.5
	German	87.9	98.1	89.9	80	80	100	95.5
Julie	English	30.6	0	43.3	18.8	67	25	14.3
	German	69.4	100	56.7	81.2	33	75	85.7
Melissa	English	53.9	.5	47.3	11.1	100	0	12.5
	German	46	99.5	52.7	88.9	0	0	87.5
John	English	40.6	0	47.8	10	21.2	0	26.7
	German	59.4	100	52.2	90	78.8	0	73.3
Tom	English	21	22.7	45.8	19	36.4	72.7	46.9
	German	78.9	77.3	54.2	81	63.6	27.3	53.1
Beth	English	17.8	3.0	18.1	74.8	36	57.1	27.3
	German	82.2	97	81.9	25.2	64	42.9	72.7

Table 8: Mean use of English by function

Percentage of English by function, divided among German and American teachers

Based on c-unit analysis

	Grmr.	Cont.	Instr.	Vocab	Humor	Chast.	Praise
Germans	9.4	1.6	10.6	29.7	11.5	0	1.5
Americans	32.8	5.2	40.5	26.7	48.7	31	25.5

Administrative vocabulary and classroom management

Polio and Duff's categories of administrative vocabulary and classroom management were also found in the current sample. They considered administrative vocabulary, which included isolated words such as *review session*, *midterm* and *quiz* to be a separate function from classroom management, which often consisted of complete utterances regarding assignments and in-class tasks, while I considered both types of administrative language under the category Instructions in my analysis. Both the native Germans and the Americans that I studied codeswitched occasionally when giving this type of general instructions. However, there were important differences between the two groups, as the Americans switched to English much more often than the Germans did for this function. On average, 40% of the American's instructions were in English, while only 11% of Germans' instructions were in English. Examples and further discussion of this type of topic-based codeswitching can be found in my treatment of Gumperz's situational codeswitching, above.

Grammar instruction

This function of codeswitching was also observed in the current study, again, with important differences between the German and American teachers. All teachers alternated languages to some extent when explaining and practicing grammatical forms. However, the American teachers studied used considerably more English for this purpose than the German instructors did. On average, 33% of the Americans' grammar instruction was in English, while 9% of the Germans' grammar instruction was in English, which suggests that codeswitching was much more frequent for the Americans than for the Germans. Since grammar is one of the topics that prompted some teachers to codeswitch, it is discussed with respect to Gumperz's function of situational switching, above.

Solidarity

This function of codeswitching corresponds to one of the CS types identified by Gumperz, although the names are somewhat different. What Polio and Duff (1994) call solidarity, Gumperz refers to as personalization; in both categories, speakers change languages in order to express solidarity or empathy with their interlocutors. In my analysis, I considered the subfunctions humor, and praise and encouragement, which some speakers used to reduce the distance between themselves and the students in their classes. While both Gumperz and Polio and Duff consider the functions of indexing solidarity and personalization, I chose to subdivide this notion into the more specific categories of humor and

praise/encouragement in order to more closely analyze how teachers maintained interpersonal relationships with their students. As with the above categories, there were noteworthy differences between the German and the American teachers. The American instructors used more English for the interpersonal functions of humor and praise and encouragement than the German teachers did. Cross teacher means demonstrate that difference; the Americans used English for 49% of their humor and 26% of their praise and encouragement, while Germans used English for these purposes 12% and 2% of the time, respectively. These means suggest that Americans codeswitch much more than Germans do in order to create closeness to their students. For more examples and discussion of this function of CS, see the discussion of personalization and objectification under Gumperz's typology.

English practice by the teacher

This function of codeswitching was not common in the current sample. The Germans had all lived in the U.S. for several years at the time of the study and spoke excellent English; they rarely questioned their intuitions about English during class time. Because the Germans did not speak very much English in class, there was little material for them to question. In this sample, there was an example of a German native speaker asking his students about the correctness of his utterance in English. In the following excerpt, Dieter used English to verify that students understood how to form the subjunctive for quotations.

- 1 D: OK, ganz kurz auf Englisch
- 2 Do you see (.) what's going on here
- 3 Do you understand this?
- 4 You take subjunctive one, if it's identic, identical?
- 5 Ss: (identical)
- 6 D: Identical with indicative then you just
- 7 You take subjunctive two

In this excerpt, Dieter was using English to make a grammatical point when he asked if he had used a word correctly (line 4). His use of English put the students briefly in the role of authority that he normally played in class. This practice of English is limited therefore to a few words, as the rest of the discussion deals with German grammar. Because of the high English proficiency of the German native speakers involved, because of the low frequency of their English, and because only three of the eight teachers studied were native speakers of the target language, this function of codeswitching was not common in the current sample. This category has no counterpart in Gumperz's work in part because the functions he identified are not based on interaction in classrooms; in an academic setting, speakers might be more concerned with accurate speech, even in the students' native language, while speakers in other settings are more likely to focus on meaning rather than form.

Translation of unknown target language vocabulary

Both German and American teachers codeswitched in order to introduce or explain new target language vocabulary. Although there was variation among individual instructors, the means for the two groups were quite similar.

Americans used English for 27% of their vocabulary-related talk, while Germans used English for 30% of this function. The following examples give some insight into why there is such a disparity of styles among teachers. The most frequent method of defining vocabulary in English was through brief, often single-word utterances by teachers. Typically, teachers used words that they perceived to be unfamiliar to their students; they then asked students what the word meant. After students responded in English, the teachers confirmed the accuracy of that response, usually by repeating the translation equivalent in English. This sequence is illustrated by the following excerpt. Here, Beth talked about how a book or movie review might be structured and how to evaluate the effectiveness of such a review. She began by reading criteria that were listed in the course textbook; after verifying students' comprehension of the German word *Ziel*, she continued reading.

- 1 B: Und das Ziel
- 2 Was ist ein Ziel?
- 3 S: Goal
- 4 B: Goal, mm-hm, gut
- 5 Leser davon zu überzeugen dass die Wertungskriterien und Belege zutreffend sind

- 1 B: *And the goal*
- 2 *What is a goal?*
- 3 S: Goal
- 4 B: Goal, mm-hm, *good*
- 5 *To convince readers that the evaluation criteria and examples are appropriate*

The teacher's English in this excerpt consisted of only the word *goal* because that was all that was necessary to achieve the desired end, namely, to verify that

students understood the criteria described in the textbook. Such translation equivalents were very common in Beth's teaching and were her most common use of English.

Not all teachers used English to verify student comprehension of vocabulary. In the following excerpt, teacher Dieter had given his students some German chocolate to try; because this chocolate contained a candy that crackles when it melts, he told his students not to bite the chocolate but to let it melt slowly in their mouths.

- 1 D: Wenn ihr es in den Mund nehmt, dann sollt ihr nicht kauen
- 2 Ihr sollt lutschen, was ist lutschen?
- 3 S: Suck on it
- 4 D: Ja, einfach ganz normal lutschen und schauen was passiert

- 1 D: *When you put it in your mouth, you shouldn't chew*
- 2 *You should suck, what is suck?*
- 3 S: Suck on it
- 4 D: *Yes, simply suck on it normally and see what happens*

Similar to Beth above, Dieter used a word that might have been unfamiliar to his students, so he asked them what it meant. When a student gave the correct translation equivalent, he did not repeat the English term but instead continued his instructions in German. He verified the correct response through both by answering with yes and by continuing with his instructions. Though English was used to verify students' comprehension of a lexical item, the teacher himself did not speak English, eliciting the English translation equivalent from his students instead of providing it for them.

Teachers also sometimes produced brief replies in German in response to students' requests for vocabulary. In the following example, the class discussed their families and their notion of an ideal partner. One student wanted to express

his opinion about children but lacked the specific vocabulary he wanted. When the student asked, Melissa provided him with the German word for the notion *useless*.

- 1 S: Ich hasse Kinder
- 2 M: Ach so, du magst Kinder nicht, ja?
- 3 S: (xxx) useless
- 4 M: Bitte?
- 5 S: Wie sagt man useless
- 6 M: Nutzlos

- 1 S: *I hate children*
- 2 M: *Oh, you don't like children, right?*
- 3 S: (xxx) useless
- 4 M: *Excuse me?*
- 5 S: *How do you say useless*
- 6 M: *Useless*

The above exchange represents the most frequent way that the teachers in this sample presented new vocabulary in German: students asked for a word, and teachers provided the target language equivalent of that word. Such transmission of vocabulary corresponds to what Butzkamm (1998) calls a conversational lubricant; that is, the students' L1 is used only to keep conversation flowing, as learners ask for vocabulary that is needed in order to communicate meaning in the L2.

Some teachers also introduced new vocabulary by providing lengthy explanations in German. In the following excerpt, Julie introduced the word *turtle* in order to provide examples of slow-moving things; such vocabulary was needed in order to make comparisons and to use comparative forms of adjectives.

- 1 J: Eine Schildkröte ist so ein, ein, ist es,
- 2 Ich glaube, das ist ein Reptilien, und das hat
- 3 Dieses Tier ist manchmal klein und manchmal groß
- 4 Und hat das Haus an dem Rücken ((demonstrates))

- 1 J: *A turtle is kind of a, a, is it*
- 2 *I think it's a reptile, and it has*
- 3 *This animal is sometimes small and sometimes large*
- 4 *And has its house on its back ((demonstrates))*

This teacher used both a rather lengthy description in German and physical gesture in order to convey the idea of *turtle*. Her description appears to have been successful, since students later successfully compare a turtle to a rabbit. Native and non-native speaking teachers alike used longer descriptions in German to convey new vocabulary to their students. In the following passage, Dieter talked about the population of Switzerland relative to its size; in doing so, he used and then defined the term *population density*.

- 1 D: Da seht ihr wie viel weniger Menschen dort wohnen
- 2 Ah ah ah <stutters> das Land ist klein und ist
- 3 Aber die Bevölkerungsdichte, das heißt, wie viele Menschen pro Quadratkilometer wohnen, ist auch nicht so hoch, eigentlich ja
- 4 Es ist, ja ganz angenehm

- 1 D: *There you can see how many fewer people live there*
- 2 *Ah ah ah <stutters> the country is small and is*
- 3 *But the population density, that is, how many people live per square kilometer, is also not so high, actually, yeah*
- 4 *It is, well, really pleasant*

Dieter's explanation of the term *population density* is much briefer than the description of a turtle that Julie gave; however, both served similar functions in their classes, namely introducing new vocabulary. Such monolingual means of

introducing vocabulary, along with the more typical translations, help to account for the variation in teachers' codeswitching for this function.

Vocabulary transmittal is not found in Gumperz's codeswitching typology because such a function appears to be unique to classroom interaction, which Gumperz did not study. Speakers in non-academic settings do sometimes codeswitch because of lexical gaps or because of the emotional appeal of words in one language over those in another. However, speakers outside of classroom settings are more concerned with simply communicating and do not typically try to teach their interlocutors new words.

Remedy of lack of student understanding

This function of codeswitching to English was identified in the present study but was not considered as a function separate from grammar practice, discussion of cultural content, and general instructions, since most student misunderstanding pertained to these topics. Below is one example of a teacher reacting to student misunderstanding during a grammatical task. Here, Julie's class completed an exercise requiring students to transform sentences from the active to the passive voice. The excerpt begins with the student reading the active sentence aloud before transforming it.

- 1 S: Man hat Energie gebraucht
- 2 J: What tense would it be?
- 3 S: Narrative past
- 4 J: Narrative past
- 5 OK, hier haben wir narrative past
- 6 S: Energie ist von (man) gebraucht
- 7 J: Ja, Energie ist gebraucht?

- 8 S: Worden
 9 J: Worden
 10 Man, man <Ger. pron.> isn't really important enough to even
 warrant a prepositional phrase
 11 So, just Energie ist gebraucht worden
 12 Energy was needed, OK
- 1 S: *One needed energy*
 2 J: What tense would it be?
 3 S: Narrative past
 4 J: Narrative past
 5 OK, *here we have* narrative past
 6 S: *Energy has <sic> needed by (one)*
 7 J: *Yes, energy has needed?*
 8 S: *Been*
 9 J: *Been*
 10 *One, one isn't really important enough to even warrant a*
prepositional phrase
 11 So, just *energy has been needed*
 12 Energy was needed, OK

After the student incorrectly completed the exercise in line 6, Julie first used German to elicit the correct verb form. The student had also made a mistake in including the agent *man*, or one, in the active version of the sentence. To remedy this, Julie used English to explain the rule and to provide a translation equivalent of the entire sentence. In this instance, the instructor responded in English to an identifiable student error. In other cases, however, teachers sometimes switched languages before it was obvious that students had misunderstood; they seemed to anticipate student misunderstanding and to switch languages preemptively. In such instances, teachers may have been accommodating to perceived needs that had not yet been expressed. For further examples of codeswitching to remedy both perceived and demonstrated student

misunderstanding, refer to my discussion of Gumperz's categories of reiteration and qualification.

Interactive effects

Both German and American teachers' code choice was influenced by the language their students used as well as by the topic of discussion. That is, teachers sometimes responded in English to student questions or comments in English, even when the surrounding teacher talk was in German; the language of the preceding turn in the interaction influenced teacher language choice. There was little difference between Germans and Americans in this regard. Americans' English was preceded by English questions or comments by students for 10% of all English spoken; for Germans, this number was 12%. Tables 9 and 10 present individual and group means for this function.

Table 9 Frequency of switching due to interaction effects

Based on only English

Raw numbers of c-units in English

Percentages based on raw numbers over total English c-units spoken

Teacher	interaction effects
Renate	8 (22%)
Bernd	4 (2.7%)
Dieter	12 (10.6%)
Julie	15 (4.6%)
Melissa	20 (6.9%)
John	36 (5.6%)
Tom	15 (7.9%)
Beth	42 (22.3%)

Table 10: Group means for interaction effects

Group of teachers	interaction effects
Germans	11.8
Americans	9.5

The following examples demonstrate the ways that teachers' language choice was influenced by the language of their students. In the following example, Beth encouraged her students to attend the German play being performed on campus that week and offered tickets for sale. She indicated when she was planning to go and asked who was planning to attend.

- 1 S: Can you buy it at the door
- 2 B: Ja, du kannst sie auch (xxx)
- 3 Niemand, möchte gehen? Es ist wirklich gut, ja
- 4 S: Saturday (xxx)
- 5 B: Samstag oder morgen Abend
- 6 Ich gehe morgen Abend, wenn ihr mich sehen wollt dann (xxx)
- 7 (.)
- 8 Oder wenn ihr mich nicht sehen wollt, (xxx)
- 9 Das ist schade <that more students aren't going to the play>
- 10 S: I went last year and I enjoyed it last year
- 11 B: Well, go again
- 12 S: I can't, I'm busy both nights

- 1 S: Can you buy it at the door
- 2 B: *Yes, you can (xxx) it (xxx) too*
- 3 *Nobody, wants to go? It's really good, yeah*
- 4 S: Saturday (xxx)
- 5 B: *Saturday or tomorrow night*
- 6 *I'm going tomorrow night if you want to see me then (xxx)*
- 7 (.)
- 8 *Or if you don't want to see me (xxx)*
- 9 *That's too bad* <that more students aren't going to the play>
- 10 S: I went last year and I enjoyed it last year
- 11 B: Well, go again
- 12 S: I can't, I'm busy both nights

The teacher used German to encourage students to attend the play and she responded in German to a question in English in line 4. Moments later, however, another student comment in English prompted a response in English (line 11).

One student comment in English provoked a response in German while the next one triggered a reply in English; in fact, the next several utterances by this teacher were then in English. After the subject of tickets was discussed in English, the teacher announced the plan for the class hour; this announcement was made in German, and class continued largely in German.

Native speakers of German were also susceptible to interaction effects; that is, students' use of English sometimes prompted the German natives to switch to English as well. In the following excerpt, Renate discussed a short story with her class when a student posed a question in English.

- 1 R: Ja, wir wissen definitiv dass er dort gearbeitet hat, im KZ
- 2 S: (Does he) does he actually say that
- 3 He just says like he's really familiar with the grounds
- 4 R: No it is in the text that he worked there

- 1 R: *Yes, we know definitively that he worked there, in the concentration camp*
- 2 S: (Does he) does he actually say that
- 3 He just says like he's really familiar with the grounds
- 4 R: No it is in the text that he worked there

This teacher's switch to English was uncharacteristic for her; on other occasions, she responded to students' English with German, sometimes requesting that students rephrase their questions in German. Here, however, she responded in English. A possible explanation lies in consideration of traditional classroom IRE sequences. Mehan (1979) identifies the standard classroom question and answer sequence as initiation, response and evaluation; in other words, teachers are typically the ones in a position to both ask questions and evaluate the correctness of students' responses. In this excerpt, the student asked a question of the teacher,

not the other way around (line 2); perhaps his unexpected question helps to account for the teacher's use of English. By asking an unsolicited question, the student took Renate out of her dominant teacher role briefly, and she answered him in English. Both his question and the language he used prompted the teacher to use English. Although Renate responded to a student's use of English, she spoke only very little English before continuing the discussion in German.

Some teachers showed evidence of awareness of their interaction-related switches and of desire to avoid such use of English. In the following example, Melissa reviewed answers to questions that students had discussed with classmates; one of the questions contained the expression *deiner Meinung nach* (in your opinion).

- 1 M: Was bedeutet deiner Meinung nach?
- 2 S: In your opinion
- 3 M: In your opinion, mm-hm
- 4 S: Could you (xxx) using it, or
- 5 M: You could--Er hätte sagen können, eh
- 6 Meg Ryan ist meiner Meinung nach die beste Schauspielerin

- 1 M: *What does deiner Meinung nach mean?*
- 2 S: In your opinion
- 3 M: In your opinion, mm-hm
- 4 S: Could you (xxx) using it, or
- 5 M: You could—*he could have said*, eh
- 6 *Meg Ryan is in my opinion the best actress*

In line 3, Melissa used English to verify the meaning of a expression that she perceived to be new or unfamiliar to students, much as many other instructors in this sample did. This confirmation was followed by a student request in

English to use the expression in a sentence. Melissa began to reply to this request in English but interrupted herself and continued in German. This self-correction reflects her awareness of her language use as well as a conscious decision to use German for this purpose.

Summary of Polio and Duff's uses of codeswitching

All of the functions of codeswitching that Polio and Duff identified are also found in the current sample. Although I used somewhat different labels in my analysis, I found evidence of all of the functions that these researchers identified: administrative vocabulary, grammar, classroom management, solidarity, English practice by teachers, translation of unknown target language vocabulary, remedy of lack of student understanding, and interactive effects involving students' use of English. English practice by teachers was rarely found in this sample, no doubt due to the limited number of non-native speakers of English and the low frequency of English use by those teachers. The high degree of overlap between my findings and those of Polio and Duff can be attributed to the fact that both studies examined language use in university foreign language classes in the United States; although the target languages differed, the settings were analogous to one another. The similar findings for both studies suggests a systematicity to the language choices that foreign language teachers in the U.S. make; this order parallels that of other, non-classroom based speech communities.

MYERS-SCOTTON'S MARKEDNESS MODEL

In the following section, I consider how the language alternation in the classroom speech community that I studied compares to the codeswitching patterns that Myers-Scotton identified in her Markedness Model. This model identifies four ways in which multilingual speech communities can make use of the languages at their disposal (Myers-Scotton 1987 & 1988). It considers the effect that macro-level characteristics of speakers and speech situations have on language choice; Myers-Scotton focuses less on individual interactions and more on larger societal patterns. Consideration of Myers-Scotton's typology will permit comparisons between larger speech communities and the foreign language classrooms observed in the current study; similarities between them support the assertion that such classes can be considered emerging speech communities. The four patterns that Myers-Scotton identifies are sequential unmarked codeswitching, codeswitching as an unmarked choice, codeswitching as a marked choice, and exploratory codeswitching.

Sequential unmarked codeswitching and codeswitching as an unmarked choice

In sequential unmarked codeswitching, the unmarked or expected code changes when the participants or topic or setting change. For example, a speaker might naturally use Spanish at home but English at work, or Spanish with her parents but English with her neighbors. In this type of codeswitching, speakers alternate languages when speech situations change. When codeswitching is an unmarked choice, speakers alternate freely among languages; switches are smooth

and unremarkable, and individual switches do not necessarily carry meaning. In such settings, the alternating use of multiple languages is the norm, not either language individually.

My analysis of unmarked codes yielded some significant differences between the German and the American teachers in this study. Among the teachers studied, German appears to be the unmarked language for all communicative functions for the native German speakers; that is, the expected language for all parts of their class hour is German, though there is some alternation away from that language. In contrast, the American teachers studied do not have a single unmarked language for all communicative functions. The American teachers studied have a strong tendency to use all or mainly German when discussing literary or cultural content; the cross-teacher mean for this function in German is 95%. In this regard, the Americans resemble the German natives, whose group mean for this function was 98%. The two groups differed in the areas of grammar discussion and instructions; whereas the Germans' unmarked code here was German, the unmarked choice for the Americans seemed to be codeswitching. The Americans spoke more German than English for these functions, but the frequency of their alternation while discussing these topics suggests that the norm is neither language alone but rather a mix of the two; the group mean of Americans' grammar talk in English was 33%, and the group mean for their instructions in English was 41%. Such high incidence of English suggests that switching to and from English is normal for the American teachers studied, making codeswitching their unmarked choice.

The following excerpts from American teachers illustrates the frequency with which such instructors alternated languages when discussing grammar or giving directions. In the first example, Julie led an exercise on the passive voice, using both German and English.

- 1 J: Em, diese erste Übung hat mit den Präpositionen zu tun
- 2 Durch, mit oder von
- 3 OK, welche welche Präposition benutzt man meistens?
- 4 Durch, mit oder von?
- 5 Mit mit Passiv
- 6 Ss: Von
- 7 J: Von, because von you use when it's done by a what?
- 8 S: Person
- 9 J: When the action is done by a person, usually
- 10 OK, also gehen wir einfach durch das Zimmer
- 11 Wer möchte beginnen?

- 1 J: Em, *this first exercise has to do with prepositions*
- 2 *By, with or by* <they are three distinct prepositions in German>
- 3 OK, *which which preposition do you use the most?*
- 4 *By, with or by?*
- 5 *With with passive*
- 6 Ss: *By*
- 7 J: *By*, because *by* you use when it's done by a what?
- 8 S: Person
- 9 J: When the action is done by a person, usually
- 10 OK, *so let's simply go around the room*
- 11 *Who would like to begin?*

Julie introduced the exercise in German and asked a question to review the precise grammar point to be reviewed. After a student gave a correct answer, she confirmed it by reviewing the rule in English before returning to German to solicit a volunteer. This teacher tended to state grammatical rules in English but introduce activities in German; she seemed to have a preferred language for each of those sub-functions. Within the overall topic of grammatical instruction and

practice, Julie used both German and English, alternating frequently between the two.

Tom similarly used both German and English to give instructions and deal with classroom administration. In the following excerpt, he asked why he had not yet received all of the essays that were due that day.

- 1 T: Ich habe in Hand in meiner Hand nur dreizehn Arbeite, ja?
- 2 Das heißt ich habe, sieben Arbeiten nicht
- 3 Ich weiß wo deine ist, jetzt auf auf dem Server <addresses one student>
- 4 S: Ja
- 5 T: Em, das habe ich (xxx) heute morgen gemacht
- 6 (xxx) haben konnte
- 7 S: Ja ich hab es (xxx)
- 8 T: OK aber ich habe nur dreizehn Arbeite
- 9 ... <reads names of students>
- 10 (.) Ja, (xxx) hast du mir eine Arbeit gegeben?
- 11 S: (No not yet)
- 12 T: Who's given me eh who's given me eh their paper and didn't hear their names
- 13 It's possible (xxx)
- 14 S: I sent it to you by email
- 15 T: OK, and everyone else, that didn't hear their name?

- 1 T: *I have in hand in my hand only thirteen papers, OK?*
- 2 *That means I don't have, seven papers*
- 3 *I know where yours is, now on on the server* <addresses one student>
- 4 S: *Yes*
- 5 T: *Em, I did that (xxx) this morning*
- 6 *(xxx) could have*
- 7 S: *Yes, I have (xxx)*
- 8 T: *OK but I have only thirteen papers*
- 9 ... <reads names of students>
- 10 (.) *Yes, (xxx) have you given me a paper?*
- 11 S: (No not yet)

- 12 T: Who's given me eh who's given me eh their paper and didn't
hear their names
13 It's possible (xxx)
14 S: I sent it to you by email
15 T: OK, and everyone else, that didn't hear their name?

This teacher, too, began this episode of organizational talk in German but switched to English. His switch to English in line 12 may have been influenced by the student's use of English in the previous turn. He alternated to and from English several times while discussing this topic. When the matter had been clarified, he switched to German in order to begin discussing the assigned short story. Such frequent language alternation when the topic of discussion was constant suggests that codeswitching was the unmarked choice for this communicative function and this teacher.

Codeswitching as a marked choice

When codeswitching is a marked choice, speakers choose to alternate languages even when such switching is not the norm. In switching languages, speakers can change the tone of the interaction and express different aspects of their identities. Marked codeswitching was observed in the current study, but not by all teachers: the native German speakers' codeswitching to English appeared to be marked, while the Americans' CS was not. In her discussion of the Matrix Language Frame Model, Myers-Scotton (1998) describes the unmarked choice to be the language which contributes quantitatively more material to interaction. Table 9 demonstrates that the Germans spoke overall much less English than their American counterparts did, whether measured in c-units or in minutes; the

German teachers' strong preference for their native language in their classes suggests that German is their unmarked language.

Table 11: Division of all teacher talk into languages, by c-unit and by time

Multiple class hours of instructors were considered together.

First three are native Germans; last five are Americans

Teacher	% Engl. c-units	% Engl. time	% Ger. c-units	% Ger. time
Renate	5	9	95	91
Bernd	7	8	93	92
Dieter	8	10	92	90
Julie	34	31	66	69
Melissa	38	36	62	64
John	32	30	68	70
Tom	27	31	73	69
Beth	12	18	88	82

Not only the overall frequency of language spoken suggests that German is the unmarked language for the German natives; the way they spoke German and English also supports this notion. Teachers sometimes drew attention to their language alternation by explicitly identifying their switches to English or by changing their rate or volume of speech, a phenomenon that I refer to as flagging.

American teachers typically switched freely between German and English; such smoothness suggests that their language alternation was unmarked. In contrast, drawing attention to codeswitches suggests that the teachers saw their language alternation as deviant from the norm. Gafaranga (1999) notes that some instances of codeswitching are repaired while others are not; that is, sometimes speakers draw attention to their language choice and treat the alternation as a source of potential communicative disorder. By observing speakers' reactions to their language choices, one can "tell the locally relevant version of the norm" (Gafaranga 1999, 216). Hinnenkamp (1996) similarly states that repairs assume the presence of a repairable; that is, if speakers make some sort of correction or otherwise draw attention to some aspect of talk, we can assume that the speakers expect that feature to cause misunderstanding. In other words, speakers often give some sort of indication about the markedness of the language choices they make. Tables 10 and 11 present individual and group frequencies for flagged codeswitching. Both the incidence of flagged codeswitches along with a more frequent use of German suggest that, for the German natives, German was the unmarked code, with English representing a deviance from that norm.

Table 12: Frequency of flagged switches to English

Raw numbers of c-units in English per type

Percentages based on raw numbers per type over total English c-units spoken

Teacher	flagged
Renate	1 (2.7%)
Bernd	3 (2%)
Dieter	2 (1.8%)
Julie	1 (.3%)
Melissa	3 (1%)
John	0
Tom	0
Beth	1 (.5%)

Table 13: Group means of flagged codeswitching, based on percentages

Group of teachers	flagged
German	2.2
American	.4

The following excerpts illustrate German teachers' flagging of their switches to English. Here, Dieter announced his switch to English and gave a reason for the switch, namely, the importance that everyone understand the details of an internet-based assignment that he was about to explain. First, he announced an upcoming vocabulary quiz, using mainly German but also some English before being asked about a web-based assignment.

- 1 D: Vielleicht machen wir nächste Woche noch irgendwann ein Quiz anders rum, ja
- 2 Aber zuerst=
- 3 S: =So you're gonna give us the German
- 4 D: I'll give you the the German, you'll give me the English, which is easier, right?
- 5 And at some point I'll want you to know it the other way around too
- 6 S: When do we have to have our peer reviews posted?
- 7 D: OK, this has to be in English to make sure that everybody gets this
- 8 Because I was really surprised to see only eleven, em, em, eleven drafts on the web

- 1 D: *Maybe we'll have another quiz sometime next week the other way around*
- 2 *But first =*
- 3 S: =So you're gonna give us the German
- 4 D: I'll give you the the German, you'll give me the English, which is easier, right?
- 5 And at some point I'll want you to know it the other way around too
- 6 S: When do we have to have our peer reviews posted?
- 7 D: OK, this has to be in English to make sure that everybody gets this
- 8 Because I was really surprised to see only eleven, em, em, eleven drafts on the web

Dieter made an announcement about a quiz in German but switched to English in response to a student's question in English. The switch to English in line 4 seems to have been influenced by the language choice of the student. The instructor's

choice of English starting in line 7 appears more intentional. Here, too, the teacher's English was preceded by a student question in English, and so the effects of the language of the surrounding interaction cannot be ruled out. However, the teacher drew attention to his choice of English by saying not only that he would use English but also explaining why he thought it necessary. Such explanation sheds some light on the kinds of information that this instructor perceives to be difficult or especially important. In this case, the information that warranted switching to English has to do with an Internet-based assignment which was new to the class and which caused some students difficulty. Moreover, his use of English loan-words for computer terms might have triggered Dieter's switch to English; perhaps the pronunciation of the words brought about the switch, or perhaps he was more accustomed to speaking about computers in English. Dieter's labeling of his English drew attention to it as a deviation from his norm.

Not all flagged codeswitching was explicitly labelled and explained. In the following example, Renate did not label her language switch, but a change in the volume nonetheless drew attention to the shift. In the following excerpt, Renate introduced an activity in which each student was to describe an object in such a way that the other students could guess what it was. The class had just completed one example together.

- 1 R: Ihr sollt das für die anderen Studenten beschreiben mit so einem Satz
- 2 Und die anderen Studenten müssen raten was das ist
- 3 Was ist raten?
- 4 S: Guess

5 R: To guess, OK, sehr gut
6 Und macht das nach diesem Muster
7 Sagt zuerst was es ist
8 %OK, it's a kind of food or a kind of beverage or something%
9 Und dann sagt, wo, wo das, gegessen wird oder, gemacht wird oder
getragen wird

1 R: *You should describe that for the other students with this kind of
sentence*
2 *And the other students have to guess what it is*
3 *What is raten?*
4 S: Guess
5 R: To guess, OK, very good
6 *And follow this pattern*
7 *Say first what it is*
8 %OK, it's a kind of food or a kind of beverage or something%
9 *And then say, where where it is eaten or, is done or is worn*

In this passage, Renate used English to give further instructions and to model in English the sort of sentence she wanted them to produce in German. Her English in line 8 was spoken more quietly than her German in the surrounding co-text, suggesting that English is a deviation from her own classroom language norm of German. Indeed, the low frequency at which this teacher uses English, coupled with her flagging of some of the English she does produce, confirms the notion that German was the unmarked language in her classroom, with English standing in contrast to it.

The American teachers also occasionally flagged their use of English in class. In the following example, Melissa announced the change in dominant language for the grammar portion of the class and stated the reason, namely the difficulty of addressing the topic in German; although she said it would be difficult to discuss in English, she clearly meant to say German.

1 M: Wie heißt subjunctive auf Deutsch, wisst ihr?
 2 S: Subjunktiv? <German pronunciation>
 3 M: Nein, Konjunktiv
 4 S: Konjunktiv
 5 M: Konjunktiv
 6 S: Does it have anything to do with (xxx)
 7 M: Subjunctive
 8 So, em, und das ist sehr schwer auf Englisch zu erzählen, ja?
 9 Wir machen es auf Englisch, ja

1 M: *What is subjunctive called in German, do you know?*
 2 S: *Subjunktiv?* <German pronunciation of English term>
 3 M: *No, subjunctive*
 4 S: *Subjunctive*
 5 M: *Subjunctive*
 6 S: Does it have anything to do with (xxx)
 7 M: *Subjunctive*
 8 *So, em, and this is hard to say in English, right?*
 9 *We'll do it in English, yeah*

Melissa introduced the subjunctive in German, announced quite clearly her intention to switch to English and gave a reason, namely, the perceived need to discuss this grammatical topic in English because of its difficulty. During the discussion and practice of the subjunctive that followed, Melissa used some German but the bulk of the discussion was in English. In contrast, Dieter spoke only a few lines of English after he switched in the example above, and Renate produced a single c-unit in English before returning to German. Although each of the examples cited represents a single instance of flagged codeswitching, the switch by the American teacher resulted in much more English than the switches by the Germans. In addition, this example of flagged codeswitching demonstrates the Americans' topic-based language alternation. Melissa used a mix of English

and German to discuss and practice grammatical forms, and codeswitching was her unmarked choice for grammar instruction.

Exploratory codeswitching

Exploratory codeswitching occurs when speakers are unsure which language is the most appropriate in a give setting and with certain interlocutors; in such situations, speakers use different languages before finding the one or ones that seem appropriate. Such codeswitching was found occasionally in the current study. The instructors' codeswitching did not seem intended to find the appropriate language of interaction. By the time I visited classes, about half way through the semester, such negotiation had surely already taken place as teachers became familiar with their students' ability and routines and norms were established. Although teachers alternated languages in the current sample, I believe that they did not do so in order to explore the available options; rather, they codeswitched in response to topic shift or in order to accomplish pedagogical and interpersonal goals. Not all codeswitching was conscious and intentional but it may have been triggered by other identifiable co-occurring phenomena, such as students not understanding or using English. In contrast to the teachers, students seemed to experiment by alternately using both languages available to them. There are several examples in this sample of teachers reminding students to speak German. In the first brief exchange, a student used English to ask Renate how to spell a word. She elicited the same question in German before answering the question.

- 1 S: Does ermordet take (an umlaut)?
- 2 R: Wie bitte? Auf Deutsch?
- 3 S: (xxx)
- 4 R: Wie schreibt
- 5 S: Wie schreibt (xxx) Partizip

- 1 S: Does *murdered* take (an umlaut)?
- 2 R: *Excuse me? In German?*
- 3 S: (xxx)
- 4 R: *How do you spell*
- 5 S: *How do you spell (xxx) participle*

Similarly, in the following excerpt, Bernd's request that a student use German was followed by the student switching back to German. Students in Bernd's class were discussing their families' Easter traditions; when a student volunteered information in English, Bernd requested that the student use German and then modelled the German utterance for him. The student did not repeat his initial utterance in German but did use German when he continued speaking, thus following his teacher's request.

- 1 S: We used to always dress up in like black or
- 2 B: Sprich mal auf Deutsch sprich mal auf Deutsch
- 3 Wir haben uns immer schwarz angezogen
- 4 Immer jeden Tag
- 5 S: Wir haben eh, wir können nicht etwas sagen
- 6 Wir können nichts sagen

- 1 S: We used to always dress up in like black or
- 2 B: *Speak in German speak in German*
- 3 *We always dressed in black*
- 4 *Always every day*
- 5 S: *We have eh, we cannot say something*
- 6 *We can say nothing*

Some of students' use of English was noticed by not only the teacher but also the other students in class. In the following excerpt, Dieter solicited questions about a presentation on Switzerland; the speaker was a Swiss woman who was a relative of a student in class.

1 D: Gibt's noch irgendwie letzte Fragen
2 Ja?
3 S: So are tans fashionable in Switzerland?
4 D: Was?
5 S: Is tanning, like what do people look like? Are they all blond?
6 Ss: ((laughter))
7 D: Also <German pronunciation>
8 S: I don't know
9 D: Erstmal Steffi (vor lauter Aufregung)
10 S: (xxx) elsewhere in the world
11 D: Kannst du das noch einmal auf Deutsch sagen?
12 S: Ist em, wie schaut die Leuten
13 Sind die alle like schon <sic> und blond und=
14 Ss: =(laughter))

1 D: *Are there any last questions*
2 *Yes?*
3 S: So are tans fashionable in Switzerland?
4 D: *What?*
5 S: Is tanning, like what do people look like? Are they all blond?
6 Ss: ((laughter))
7 D: *Well*
8 S: I don't know
9 D: *First of all Steffi is so excited*
10 S: (xxx) elsewhere in the world
11 D: *Can you say that again in German?*
12 S: *Is, em how do the people look*
13 *Are they all like pretty and blond and=*
14 Ss: =(laughter))

Here, both the teacher and the other students responded to the student's question in English; the class's laughter was caused by both the unexpected use of English

as well as the content of the question. Up until this point, students' use of English was almost as limited as that of their teacher; their English consisted mainly of requests for vocabulary (cf. Butzkamm's discussion of students' native language as a conversational lubricant [1998, p. 95]). This excerpt demonstrates that use of English, even by students, was unexpected and a marked choice in this classroom. When students used English for purposes outside the norm, such use was remarked on and was corrected. Students explored language choice by trying to use English as well as German, but the teacher played a dominant role in deciding the appropriate allocation of languages in the classroom.

The following example from an American teacher's classroom also underscores the teacher's dominant role in classroom language choice. In this excerpt, John led a discussion of a short story, during which he confirmed students' comprehension of a lexical item that was used in both the text and the discussion.

- 1 S: Er sagt, dass Hitler viele Anziehungskraft um hat
- 2 J: Was ist Anziehungskraft?
- 3 S: (xxx)
- 4 J: Nicht auf Englisch
- 5 Uh, Kraft ist was?
- 6 S: Power
- 7 J: Ja, es ist eine Stärke, man ist kräftig, hat man eine Kraft
- 8 Anziehung, anziehen, von dem Verb anziehen
- 9 Das heißt, nicht nur die Kleider anzieh, sondern
- 10 Ziehen heißt was genau, wörtlich?
- 11 Ziehen. (.) Ich ziehe den Stuhl ((demonstrates))
- 12 S: To pull (xxx) people
- 13 J: (xxx)
- 14 Anziehung is actually uh, attractiveness, or attraction

- 1 S: *He says that Hitler has a lot of em power of attraction* <literal translation>
2 J: *What is attractiveness?*
3 S: (xxx)
4 J: *Not in English*
5 Uh, *power is what?*
6 S: Power
7 J: *Yes, it is a strength, one is powerful, one has a strength*
8 *Attraction, attract, from the verb to attract*
9 *That means, not only putting on clothing but rather* <one meaning of the verb anziehen is to get dressed>
10 *To pull means what exactly, literally?*
11 *To pull (.) I pull the chair* ((demonstrates))
12 S: To pull (xxx) people
13 J: (xxx)
14 *Attractiveness* is actually uh, attractiveness, or attraction

Although he used English at the end in order to define the word *Anziehungskraft*, John initially described the word's meaning in German and discouraged a student's attempt to provide a translation equivalent in line 4. John limited his students' use of English during the literature discussion, but not during their review of grammar, where he frequently used English himself. This teacher actively enforced his norms for the classroom, which permitted the use of English for some topics but not for others. Mehan (1979) suggests that it is the students' responsibility to learn to speak within the structures that teachers establish; although he refers to IRE sequences, this notion applies to language choice as well, since students must learn what their teachers consider acceptable language use. This example of students exploring the languages available to them confirms the notion that foreign language classes are emerging speech communities in which not all speech events are codified, and not all participants are certain of the norms. Unique to this situation is that one speaker in particular, the teacher, has a

dominant role in deciding that norm—such dominance of a single person is often found in classrooms and other formal settings, but not in casual conversation among peers.

Summary of Myers-Scotton's types of CS

My analyses uncovered evidence of all four of Myers-Scotton's codeswitching patterns, although there were important differences between the Americans and the Germans studied. First, the Americans engaged in sequential unmarked CS; they switched according to topic, using mainly German for discussions of literature but alternating languages for grammar review and general instructions. This distribution is roughly analogous to Gumperz's situational CS—as the topic changes, so too does the unmarked code. The Germans did not codeswitch nearly as often in response to topic shift, instead using mainly German for all classroom functions. A second finding is that the unmarked code for the Americans when discussing grammar and giving directions seems to be neither German nor English alone but a mix of the two; that is, CS is the unmarked code for these topics and these teachers. Both overall frequency of the two languages for these functions and the smoothness of switches between them suggest that they together comprise the unmarked choice for the topics of grammar and instructions. A third finding presents a contrast between the Germans and the Americans studied: codeswitching was a marked choice for the German native speakers. Use of English represented a deviation from their norm, as indicated by both relative frequency of the two languages and by their flagging of switches through either explicit labeling or through volume changes. Finally,

there was some evidence of exploratory codeswitching, where students in particular used both English and German. Reminders by their teachers to speak German reinforce the notion that the teachers, as the class leaders and as authority figures, set the standard for language use in their classrooms. Evidence for Myers-Scotton's categories of codeswitching suggests a systematicity of language alternation that is comparable to that of other speech communities both in and outside of classrooms.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The goal of this study was to find order in the apparent chaos of codeswitching in foreign language classes, to find patterns within the seeming random alternation of languages. To that end, I compared my data with the typologies created by previous research. I first considered Gumperz's model, which is concerned with language use as a function of the dynamics of interactions (Gumperz 1982a). Polio and Duff's research similarly studied micro-level functions of codeswitching in interaction; their work focused on interaction within foreign language classes in the U.S. (Polio and Duff 1994). I also considered the types of codeswitching identified by Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (Myers-Scotton 1987 & 1988), which consider linguistic variation to be derived from the sociological attributes of the speaker and the situation rather than from the details of specific interactional episodes.

Most of the functions and types of codeswitching identified by previous research were also found in the current sample. Of the seven types of codeswitching identified by Gumperz, five were found in my sample: situational switching, interjections, reiteration, qualification and personalization and objectivization. Only the functions of codeswitching for addressee specification and quotation were not seen in this data set. Addressees could not be specifically included or excluded on the basis of language use alone because of students shared languages and spoke comparable levels of German; the quotations

observed were generally from German texts within discussions in German, thus no codeswitching was possible there, either. There was variation among teachers' use of codeswitching for the functions that were observed. The American teachers engaged in more situational codeswitching than did Germans, switching often during grammar practice and general directions; they also switched to English more often than their German counterparts for interpersonal functions, that is, to personalize and objectivize their messages. The language alternation found in my study is in many ways comparable to that in Gumperz's work. Although I examined an emerging classroom-based speech community while he studied more established speech communities, they can both be described in similar terms, using the same functional categories of CS.

All of the functions of codeswitching identified by Polio and Duff are also found in the current sample, although our analyses differed in the labels applied to uses of codeswitching. While Polio and Duff considered administrative vocabulary and classroom management separately, I examined them together as a single category; where they studied the use of CS for solidarity, I considered the more specific interpersonal functions of humor and praise and encouragement. Despite the different nomenclature, the functions of codeswitching identified were the same: administrative vocabulary, grammar, classroom management, solidarity, English practice by teachers, translation of unknown target language vocabulary, remedy of lack of student understanding, and interactive effects involving students' use of English. Although all of Polio and Duff's functions were observed in my data, they were not performed by all teachers at the same

rate; there were important differences between the native Germans and the American teachers. Comparable functions were identifiable in both studies because of the similar subjects and settings, namely foreign language classes at American universities. The similar findings for both studies suggest an order to the way foreign language teachers in the U.S. distribute their languages during class. This systematicity parallels that of other, non-classroom based speech communities.

Evidence for all four of Myers-Scotton's codeswitching patterns was found in the current data set, although not all types of codeswitching applied to all teachers studied. The American and the German teachers varied with respect to which language was their unmarked choice for which functions. The Americans switched languages according to topic, thus engaging in sequential unmarked CS. In contrast, the Germans rarely switched to English in response to topic shift. Related to this finding, the unmarked code for the Americans when discussing grammar and giving directions seems to be neither German nor English alone but a mix of the two; that is, CS is the unmarked choice for these topics and these teachers. A third finding is that codeswitching was a marked choice for the German native speakers. The native Germans studied rarely used English in class; when they did, it represented a deviation from their norm. Finally, there was some evidence of exploratory codeswitching, where students in particular used both English and German in an attempt to determine the appropriate language for their classrooms. Evidence for Myers-Scotton's categories of codeswitching suggests a systematicity of language alternation patterns that is

comparable to that of other speech communities both in and outside of classrooms.

I found important similarities between the functions and types of codeswitching in classes of German as a foreign language that I studied and the CS functions and types identified by other researchers. These similarities suggest that the way that teachers and other multilinguals make alternating use of their languages is systematic. I do not mean to suggest that all classes and all teachers behaved in the same way, just as I would not claim that all speakers in other settings behaved identically. There is variation in all speech communities. Instead, I suggest that the variation among speakers is not haphazard. Among the teachers I studied, native language seems to be the most significant variable affecting the functional distribution of languages in the classroom; native speakers of German used English less frequently and for different functions than the native speakers of English did. Not only did German use overall much less English, the American teachers codeswitched more frequently, especially for the grammar practice, instructions, humor and praise. These observed patterns suggest that there is order to the way teachers allocate their languages in the classroom and that this order is affected by the native language of the instructor. This systematicity provides support for the notion that foreign language classrooms can be considered emerging speech communities, ones which are perhaps still in the process of determining norms but which do demonstrate patterns.

Despite the observed similarities between my data and the functions identified by other researchers, there were also differences. Gumperz's functional

categories were not all found in my data, and the codeswitching I observed fell into some categories that Gumperz did not identify. There were even some differences between the functions of CS that I observed and those identified by Polio and Duff, despite the similar settings and subjects. Although all of the functions they identified were also found in my data, the relative importance of some functions varied; for example, very little of the English spoken by the German natives in my sample seemed intended to practice their English. The differences observed between their data and mine suggest that there is variation among university teachers, among native and non-native speaking teachers, variation in teaching experience and training and beliefs, different student ability levels and different perceptions of the difficulty of the target languages involved. There are general observable patterns but there is also variation within those generalizations. Such a disparity reinforces the point made by Appel and Muysken that functions of CS vary from one speech community to the next. Of course, the functions observed by different researchers also vary; the variation discovered may be in part dependent on the researchers' interests and experience.

In this study, I have attempted to describe the patterns of codeswitching that I observed. Although it is impossible to know exactly why teachers alternated languages or what they were thinking when they did, I would now like to offer a few possible explanations for the use of English in the class sessions that I studied. Cullen (1998) points out that teachers have dual roles as both instructors and interlocutors; their goal as instructors is to help students learn to speak, read, write and understand the target language, but their goal as

interlocutors is often simply to make themselves understood. Grice (1975) similarly identifies maxims that guide conversations; among others, he suggests that speakers are guided by the desire to avoid obscurity and ambiguity and to be brief and orderly. Perhaps this dual role can account for the alternating use of two languages in foreign language classes. As instructors, teachers may want to challenge their students and provide as much input as possible in the target language, and they therefore want to speak the target language as much as possible. As interlocutors, however, they may focus on convey their message as simply and as effectively as possible; sometimes the students' native language is the most efficient way to communicate. Language alternation might be the result of teachers' balancing their dual roles in the classroom. Seedhouse (1994) similarly identifies two roles of linguistic forms, namely vehicle and focus. Teachers' switches between their languages may also be associated with the differing roles of the language itself. In other words, they might alternate languages when the focus of instruction shifts and the target language goes from being a means of communication to being the focus of instruction. I believe the existence of these dual roles accounts for some of teachers' codeswitches. Some language alternation is perhaps to be expected as teachers balance their own roles as teachers and conversation partners and the dual roles of the target language itself.

One posited function of codeswitching is to remedy students' misunderstanding; that is, teachers switched to the students' native language in order to help them understand. In her work in a bilingual Puerto Rican New York

neighborhood, Zentella discovered a principle guiding language alternation in that community, namely, “speak the best language of the addressee” (Zentella 1990, 80). If this tendency to speak the addressee’s best language is valid for other speech communities, it could explain some of the codeswitching observed in the current sample. Even if teachers intend to speak the target language, they may find themselves using English, since English is the dominant language of most of their students. On the other hand, it is possible to use more of the students’ native language than they would want or need to hear. Zéphir and Chirol’s survey of teaching assistants (TA’s) and foreign language learners revealed that TA’s and students may have different expectations and attitudes about the use of the target language in the classroom. Their study found that some TA’s assumed that their students were more worried about the difficulty of the language and the material than the students actually were. These instructors may have been overaccommodating and using simpler language and more English than even their students thought necessary.

Interestingly, the native Germans studied here did not accommodate to their students’ native language as much as I had expected. Based on my previous experience with Germans teaching their native language as well as anecdotal evidence from TA trainers and coordinators, I expected the Germans in this study to use more English than the Americans. Surprisingly, the Germans used overall much less English than did the Americans studied. The disparity between my expectations and the results might be explained by two factors. One, the Germans who took part in this study have all taught German for several years and have

experience with intermediate students and with expressing themselves using German appropriate to that level. Second, the students in the second-year classes observed were already able to say and understand a good deal of German. Perhaps the results would have been more as predicted if I had studied first-year language classes.

IMPLICATIONS

This study has implications for several areas within sociolinguistics and language pedagogy. First, my study provides a description of the foreign language classroom as an emerging bilingual speech community. The patterns and systematic variation discovered here provide evidence for the notion that the classes discovered here can be considered speech communities with norms that are comparable to those found in other, more established speech communities. It is noteworthy that this speech community is found in a classroom and that the multilingual competence of many of the speakers is still developing. Nonetheless, the patterns of language use found here parallel in many ways those found in other speech communities.

I also hope that this study will inspire discussion and reexamination of the norms and standards that language teachers implicitly or explicitly present to our students to be emulated. I think that a monolingual native-speaker norm is not an appropriate model for adult learners of a foreign language; following the argument of Blyth (1995), I believe that language teachers should present the model of a competent multilingual to our students. Cook (1999) similarly argues

that L2 users' should be presented with realistic role models of multicompetent speakers to emulate. After all, their goal is not to become native speakers of German or French or Spanish but to be able to function in the target language as well as in their native language. Moreover, the notion of a perfect bilingual should be reconsidered. Foreign language learning can be more fulfilling and more beneficial if learners are taught not to see their budding language skills as lacking or inferior with respect to native speakers' skills; rather, they and we should judge learners on their own terms, or in the context of the classroom, rather than in contrast to other speech communities where the target language is spoken natively. Intermediate learners do not have to be able to use their foreign language in all domains of their lives in order to be considered competent users of that language.

This study also addresses issues of self-perception. I hope that readers, be they foreign language teachers or linguists, will consider what their language choices mean to them and about how they present themselves through their linguistic choices. I hope that multilinguals will see multilingualism is a conversational resource, not something to be avoided; even in foreign language classes, the students' native language can have a limited but useful place as teachers and students can use the students' native language for pedagogical and interpersonal goals. I also hope that this study encourages teachers to think about the ways in which they make use of their languages in class; this study provides a framework for teachers to consider when evaluating their own language alternation patterns. Moreover, this study and others like it can inform teachers

about what kind of input learners are getting, assuming that teachers' classroom speech is the largest source of input. Research that describes the ways in which teachers alternate languages can help to answer questions about our students' acquisition of the target languages. I also hope that teachers can use studies like this to answer for themselves the question of what an ideal language use pattern is, that is, for what purposes codeswitching can be used most appropriately in their classrooms.

LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT STUDY

This study could be improved by making several changes. First, a larger data set, increasing both the number of subjects and the number of hours analyzed per subject would allow more comparisons and further in-depth analyses. In addition, after repeated observations, teachers would grow more accustomed to the presence of the camera and researcher, and the data collected would be more natural and less influenced by the presence of the recording equipment. The presence of additional recorders throughout the room would improve the data by filling in gaps in the transcription, particularly during group work where much overlapping talk made discerning speech very difficult. Such additional recording equipment would also permit closer analysis of student speech, which was often hard to understand in my recordings. Having equal numbers of men and women and of Germans and Americans would also improve the data set and make cross-group comparisons more valid.

This study would also be improved by eliciting additional information and opinions from the teachers. Although I did conduct a survey of teachers' attitudes toward language use in the classroom, I did not include survey data other than demographic information in this study. Data from the questionnaires might provide further insight into the motivation for some of the teachers' codeswitching. In addition, follow-up interviews with teachers, perhaps after viewing portions of the videotape, would have allowed teachers to describe why they believed they alternated languages at specific moments. Such introspective tasks would complement classroom observations.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research should continue to examine teachers' classroom codeswitching and their attitudes towards it. A future study should consider survey data to determine if there are correlations between teachers' beliefs toward language alternation and their behavior and to determine if there are patterns in the teachers' beliefs. Such surveys could consider possible correlations of codeswitching patterns with factors such as native language, degree of proficiency in either language, years of teaching experience and beliefs about appropriate classroom language use. In addition, teachers could be asked to discuss their own codeswitching, both generally and with respect to specific class hours; researchers could then compare teachers' perceptions of and attitudes toward codeswitching with their actual behavior. Such interviews coupled with observation would help

to answer the question of how aware teachers are of their own codeswitching and how intentional it is.

Future research should also compare codeswitching practices across languages in different language departments, different academic settings, and with different languages. Language departments have different standards and expectations from their teachers and students, which might have an effect on the ways in which teachers use their languages during class. It would therefore be helpful to consider codeswitching practices by teachers in departments that emphasize the importance of grammatical accuracy with teachers who use a communicative approach. Similarly, studies should consider codeswitching practices at large universities as well as at smaller colleges to determine what effect the academic setting has on the way teachers alternate languages. It would also be useful to investigate these questions with different target languages in order to determine if the language being taught has an effect on codeswitching patterns. Such studies should include surveys of the perceived difficulty of the target languages, since this perception can influence teachers' code choice.

The topic of classroom codeswitching can also be studied from the learners' perspective. Future research should consider when students switch between languages and for what purposes, whether and how they speak the target language with their peers or whether they speak the target language only with their teacher. Such research should study student attitudes towards their own and their teachers' language alternation as well as their actual practices. As stated above, such research should be conducted in different academic settings in order

to consider the effect of different student ability and attitude on their language behavior.

There are many directions that future research can take, from the more pedagogical to the more sociolinguistic. I hope that this study provides one piece of the puzzle in describing the codeswitching patterns found in this particular sample of teachers. The description of these classes as systematic provides support for the notion that such classes can be considered developing multilingual speech communities. In addition, I hope that this study initiates further discussion and research on the topics of classroom codeswitching and norms for classroom language.

Appendix A: Teacher Survey

Teacher survey

Most language teachers have a notion of what sort of language use is appropriate in foreign language classes, based on both experience and training. Sometimes teachers' personal and professional opinions differ from those of well-known pedagogical approaches. This study seeks to determine what teachers themselves think about the use of German and English in classes of German as a foreign language, not what they think others believe or what they perceive to be an accepted norm for foreign language teaching.

Please answer the following questions with respect to second-year German classes at the University of Texas. Which language do you personally feel is more appropriate in the following situations? Use the scale below, and circle the appropriate number for each item.

1	2	3	4	5
Mostly or all English	More English than German	Equal mix of German and English	More German than English	Mostly or all German

Situation

Ideal Language(s)

1. To introduce a grammar topic

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. For classroom management (e.g., requesting quiet, calling on students) | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. To give feedback on grammatical accuracy in student speech | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. To offer tips on writing style | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. To explain a task or assignment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. When addressing students during pair work | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. To give feedback on accuracy in writing | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. To review a grammar topic | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. To respond to content of student speech when you agree with what they've said | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. To introduce a text or video (pre-reading or pre-viewing activities) | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. To tell personal anecdotes related to culture | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. To discuss cultural topics | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. To respond to content of writing | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

14. To encourage students having difficulty
- 1 2 3 4 5
15. To greet students before class
- 1 2 3 4 5
16. During office hours
- 1 2 3 4 5
17. To offer study suggestions
- 1 2 3 4 5
18. To praise good performance
- 1 2 3 4 5
19. To discuss the format of an upcoming test
- 1 2 3 4 5
20. To announce films and lectures
- 1 2 3 4 5
21. To discuss content of video or reading
- 1 2 3 4 5
22. For humor
- 1 2 3 4 5
23. To announce changes to the syllabus
- 1 2 3 4 5
24. When addressing the class as a whole
- 1 2 3 4 5
25. To respond to content of student speech when there is a
communication problem
- 1 2 3 4 5

26. To offer tips on oral expression (e.g., circumlocution skills)

1 2 3 4 5

27. To greet students during chance meetings on campus

1 2 3 4 5

28. To say good-bye after class 1 2 3 4 5

29. To define or describe a new vocabulary word

1 2 3 4 5

30. During chance meetings on campus

1 2 3 4 5

31. What do you think second-year students would prefer to hear and
use in class? 1 2 3 4 5

32. What do you think your supervisor would prefer that you use in
class? 1 2 3 4 5

33. Overall, what do you think should be used in class?

1 2 3 4 5

Now please rate the following items in terms of how important they are to you as a teacher, using the following scale.

1 extremely important	2 somewhat important	3 neutral	4 not very important	5 not at all important
-----------------------------	----------------------------	--------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

1. Grammatically accurate speech

1 2 3 4 5

2. Students' enthusiasm for German

1 2 3 4 5

3. Helping students express themselves in German

1 2 3 4 5

4. Making students feel comfortable in class

1 2 3 4 5

5. Student performance on written grammar tests

1 2 3 4 5

6. Helping students speak about topics of interest to them

1 2 3 4 5

7. Challenging your strongest students to expand their abilities

1 2 3 4 5

8. Making sure students understand almost every word that's said
- 1 2 3 4 5
9. Helping all students to learn grammar and vocabulary
- 1 2 3 4 5
10. Having a good time while teaching
- 1 2 3 4 5
11. Culturally appropriate speech
- 1 2 3 4 5
12. Helping students write about topics of interest to them
- 1 2 3 4 5
13. Making sure that weaker students don't fall behind
- 1 2 3 4 5
14. Having students learn to make reasonable guesses about unknown
word
- 1 2 3 4 5
15. Students' enjoyment of German class
- 1 2 3 4 5
16. Helping students learn about how language works in general
- 1 2 3 4 5

Please answer the following questions about yourself and your language learning experience. No personal information will be attributed to you by name in any study published in connection with this research.

Name _____

Native language _____

How did you learn your second language? Through formal instruction, through family members, through living in a country where it is spoken, or some combination?

How many years of teaching experience do you have? Include all formal teaching experience, e.g., high school, college.

Please tell me about teacher training and language pedagogy courses you have had.

You are under no obligation to participate in the study. Your completing and returning the questionnaire will be taken as evidence of your willingness to participate and your consent to have the information used for purposes of the study. If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact me (Lisa Seidlitz) or my dissertation advisor (Prof. Mark Southern) at the Department of Germanic Studies at 471-4123.

Appendix B: Student Survey

Student survey

Every teacher's style is different. By now, you've been learning foreign languages long enough to have an idea of what works for you and what doesn't. One way in which language teachers vary is in the amount of the foreign language that they use in class. This study seeks to determine what language students prefer to experience in their foreign language classes.

Please answer the following questions with respect to the teacher of your second-year German class at the University of Texas. Which language do you personally feel is more appropriate in the following situations? Use the scale below, and circle the appropriate number for each item.

1 Mostly or all English	2 More English than German	3 Equal mix of German and English	4 More German than English	5 Mostly or all German
-------------------------------	----------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	------------------------------

Situation

Ideal Language(s)

Introducing a new grammar topic	1	2	3	4	5
Classroom management (e.g., requesting quiet, calling on students)					
	1	2	3	4	5
Feedback on grammatical accuracy in student speech					
	1	2	3	4	5
Tips on writing style	1	2	3	4	5
Explanation of a task or assignment	1	2	3	4	5
Speaking to students during pair work					
	1	2	3	4	5
Reviewing a grammar topic	1	2	3	4	5
Feedback on accuracy in writing	1	2	3	4	5
Response to the content of student speech					
	1	2	3	4	5
Introduction a text or video (pre-reading or pre-viewing activities)					
	1	2	3	4	5
Personal cultural anecdotes	1	2	3	4	5
Response to content of writing	1	2	3	4	5
During office hours	1	2	3	4	5
Encouraging students having difficulty					
	1	2	3	4	5
Greeting students before class	1	2	3	4	5
Discussing content of video or reading					

	1	2	3	4	5
Discussing cultural topics	1	2	3	4	5
Praising good performance	1	2	3	4	5
Discussing the format of an upcoming test					
	1	2	3	4	5
Announcing films and lectures	1	2	3	4	5
For humor	1	2	3	4	5
Announcing changes to the syllabus	1	2	3	4	5
Speaking to the class as a whole	1	2	3	4	5
Responding to content of student speech when there is a communication problem	1	2	3	4	5
Offering tips on oral expression (e.g., how to describe things you don't know the word for)	1	2	3	4	5
Offering study suggestions	1	2	3	4	5
Saying hello to students during chance meetings on campus					
	1	2	3	4	5

Saying good-bye after class	1	2	3	4	5
Defining or describing a new vocabulary word					
	1	2	3	4	5
During chance meetings on campus	1	2	3	4	5
What do you think second-year students in general prefer to hear in class?	1	2	3	4	5
What do you think second-year students in general prefer to use in class?	1	2	3	4	5
What do you personally prefer to use in class?	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, what language do you think your teacher should use in class?	1	2	3	4	5

Now please rate the following items in terms of how important they are to you as a language learner, using the following scale.

1	2	3	4	5
extremely	somewhat	neutral	not very	not at all
important	important		important	important

Grammatically accurate speech	1	2	3	4	5
Expressing yourself in German	1	2	3	4	5
Feeling comfortable in class	1	2	3	4	5
Performing well on written grammar tests	1	2	3	4	5
Speaking about topics of interest to you	1	2	3	4	5
Challenging yourself to expand your abilities	1	2	3	4	5
Understanding almost every word that's said	1	2	3	4	5
Learning grammar and vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5
Having a good time in class	1	2	3	4	5
Culturally appropriate speech	1	2	3	4	5
Writing about topics of interest to you					

	1	2	3	4	5
Making sure you don't fall behind	1	2	3	4	5
Learning to get the gist of things you read and hear	1	2	3	4	5
Learning about how language works in general	1	2	3	4	5

Please answer the following questions about yourself and your language learning experience. No personal information will be attributed to you by name in any study published in connection with this research.

Name _____

Native language _____

How did you learn your second language? Through formal instruction, through family members, through living in a country where it is spoken, or some combination?

How many years of formal language learning experience do you have, e.g., high school, college? What other languages have you learned or do you know?

You are under no obligation to participate in the study. Your completing and returning the questionnaire will be taken as evidence of your willingness to participate and your consent to have the information used for purposes of the study. If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact me (Lisa Seidlitz) or my dissertation advisor (Prof. Mark Southern) at the Department of Germanic Studies at 471-4123.

Appendix C: Transcription conventions

Teachers are identified by letters R, B, D, J, M, J, T, and B

Students are identified in transcripts as S or Ss

,	short pause
(.)	longer pause
?	rising intonation, not necessarily question
goo:d	lengthening of vowel
no-	abrupt cutoff, self-interruption
because	stressed
BECAUSE	increased volume
%because%	decreased volume
((laughs))	non-verbal action
<continues>	transcriber's comment
(xxx)	unintelligible
(weil)	assumed wording
(...)	omission
//yeah//	overlap of speech from different speakers
//yes//	
you=	no gap between utterances (latching)
=but	

Bibliography

- Adendorff, Ralph D. 1996. The functions of code switching among high school teachers and students in KwaZulu and implications for teacher education. In Kathleen M. Bailey and David Nunan, eds. *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education*. New York: Cambridge UP. 388-406.
- Alvarez-Caccamo, Celso. 1998. From 'switching code' to 'code-switching': Towards a reconceptualization of communicative codes. In Peter Auer, ed. *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London and New York: Routledge. 29-48.
- Antón, Marta and Frederick DiCamilla. 1998. Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 54: 314-342.
- Appel, Rene, and Pieter Muysken. 1987. *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Apte, Mahadev L. 1985. *Humor and Laughter: An anthropological approach*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.
- Arthur, Jo. 1996. Code switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. *Linguistics & Education* 8: 17-33.
- Auer, Peter. 1984. *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Auer, Peter, ed. 1998. *Codeswitching in conversation*. London: Routledge.
- Auerbach, Elsa Roberts. 1993. Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 27: 9-32.
- Backus, Ad. 1996. Mixed discourse as a reflection of bilingual proficiency. In Tina Hickey and Jenny Williams, eds. *Language, education and society in a changing world*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 127-135.
- Barbour, Stephen and Patrick Stevenson. 1990. *Variation in German: A critical introduction to German sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen. 1992. A second look at T-unit analysis: Reconsidering the sentence. *TESOL Quarterly* 26: 390-95.

- Birken-Silverman, Gabriele. 1997. Erscheinungsformen des elsässisch-französischen code-switching: Eine typologische Klassifikation. *Linguistische Berichte* 169: 196-210.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Blyth, Carl. 1995. Foreign language class as a multilingual speech community. In Claire Kramsch, ed. *Redefining boundaries of language study*. Boston: Heinle. 143-181.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik. 1998. Codeswitching, codemixing and code alternation: What a difference. In Rodolfo Jacobson, ed. *Codeswitching Worldwide*. Trends in Linguistics 106. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 15-24.
- Bogdan, Robert C., and Sari Knopp Biklen. 1998. *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bokamba, Eyamba G. 1988. Code-mixing, language variation and linguistic theory: Evidence from Bantu languages. *Lingua* 76: 21-62.
- Bond, Michael, and Tat-Ming Lai. 1986. Embarrassment and code switching into a second language. *Journal of Social Psychology* 126: 179-86.
- Borg, Simon. 1998. Talking about grammar in the foreign language classroom. *Language Awareness* 7: 159-75.
- Brice, Alejandro, Marla Mastin, and Carol Perkins. 1998. English, Spanish and code-switching use in the ESL classroom: An ethnographic study. *Journal of Children's Communication Development* 19, 2: 11-20.
- Burt, Susan Meredith. 1992. Codeswitching, convergence and compliance: The development of micro-community speech norms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13: 169-85.
- Butzkamm, Wolfgang. 1998. Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: The mother tongue as a conversational lubricant. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 1: 81-99.
- Camilleri, Antoinette. 1996. Language values and identities: Code switching in secondary classrooms in Malta. *Linguistics & Education* 8: 85-103.

- Canagarajah, A. Suresh. 1995. Functions of codeswitching in ESL classrooms: Socialising bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development* 16: 173-95.
- Cazden, Courtney B. 1988. *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clyne, Michael. 1995. *The German language in a changing Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Clyne, Michael. 1987. Constraints on CS: How universal are they? *Linguistics* 25: 739-64.
- Clyne, Michael. 1981. "Second generation" foreigner talk in Australia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 28: 69-80.
- Cook, Vivian. 1999. Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 33: 185-209.
- Cook, Vivian. 2002. Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Journal* 57: 402-16.
- Crookes, Graham. 1997. SLA and language pedagogy: A socioeducational perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19: 93-116.
- Crookes, Graham. 1990. The utterance, and other basic units for second language discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics* 11: 183-99.
- Cullen, Richard. 1998. Teacher talk and the classroom context. *ELT Journal* 52: 179-187.
- Diebold, Jr., A. Richard. 1964. Incipient bilingualism. In Dell Hymes, ed. *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology*. New York: Harper and Row. 495-508.
- Duff, Patricia A., and Charlene G. Polio. 1990. How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Modern Language Journal* 74: 154-166.
- Fasold, Ralph. 1984. *The sociolinguistics of society*. Language in Society 5. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Fishman, Joshua. 1965. Who speaks what language to whom and when? *Linguistique* 1: 67-88.
- Gafaranga, Joseph. 1999. Language choice as a significant aspect of talk organization: The orderliness of language alternation. *Text* 19: 201-25.
- Gal, Susan. 1988. The political economy of code choice. In Monica Heller, ed. *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 245-264.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 1995. Codeswitching in community, regional and national repertoires: The myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems. In Leslie Milroy and Pieter Muysken, eds. *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on codeswitching*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 68-89.
- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 1991. *Language selection and switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Genesee, Fred, and Richard Y. Bourhis. 1982. The social psychological significance of codeswitching in cross-cultural communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 1: 1-27.
- Giauque, Gerald S. 1975. Using native speakers as teaching assistants. *Foreign Language Annals* 8: 128-32.
- Giauque, Gerald, and Christopher M. Ely. 1990. Codeswitching in beginning foreign language teaching. In Rodolfo Jacobson & Christian Faltis, eds. *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling*. Cleveland: Multilingual Matters. 174-84.
- Giles, Howard, Nikolas Coupland and Justine Coupland. 1991. Accommodation theory: Communication, context and consequence. In Howard Giles, Nikolas Coupland and Justine Coupland, eds. *Contexts of Communication: Developments in applied sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 1-68.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan, eds. *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press. 41-58.

- Grosjean, François. 1985. The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6: 467-77.
- Gumperz, John J. 1962. Types of linguistic communities. *Anthropological Linguistics* 4: 28-40.
- Gumperz, John J. 1972. Introduction. In John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982a. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982b. *Language and social identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Gumperz, John J. 1997. On the interactional bases of speech community membership. In: Gregory Guy, et al., eds. *Towards a social science of language: Papers in honor of William Labov*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 183-203.
- Gumperz, John J., and J.P. Blom. 1972. Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code switching in Norway. In John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York. 407-34.
- Gumperz, John J. and Eduardo Hernandez-Chavez. 1972. Bilingualism, bidialectalism, and classroom interaction. In Courtney B. Cazden, Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes, eds. *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press. 84-108.
- Hancock, Mark. 1997. Behind classroom code switching: Layering and language choice in L2 learner interaction. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 217-35.
- Harder, Peter. 1980. Discourse as self-expression: On the reduced personality of the second-language learner. *Applied Linguistics* 1: 262-70.
- Haugen, Einar. 1969. *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior*. Vol. 1: *The bilingual community*. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Haust, Delia. 1993. Formen und Funktionen des Codeswitching. *Linguistische Berichte* 144: 93-129.

- Heller, Monica. 1988. *Codeswitching*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, Monica. 1992. The politics of codeswitching and language choice. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13: 123-42.
- Heller, Monica. 1996. Legitimate language in a multilingual school. *Linguistics and Education* 8: 139-57.
- Heller, Monica. 1994. *Crosswords: Language, education and ethnicity in French Ontario*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, Monica, and Carol Pfaff. 1996. Code-switching. In H. Goebel, P. Nelde, Z. Stary, and W. Wölck, eds. *Kontaktlinguistik / Contact linguistics / Linguistique de Contact*. Berlin and NY: Walter de Gruyter. 594-609.
- Hinnenkamp, Volker. 1996. Transkripte als transformierte Stücke von Wirklichkeit. Unpublished MS.
- Hinnenkamp, Volker. 1998. Transforming outgroup categorisations into ingroup identities: Language mixing and language creativity of Turkish adolescents. Unpublished MS.
- Hird, Bernard. 1996. The incompatible objectives of groupwork in FL learning: A study of Chinese-English codeswitching. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 9: 163-75.
- Hoffer, Bates L. 1996. Borrowing. In H. Goebel, P. Nelde, Z. Stary, and W. Wölck, eds. *Kontaktlinguistik / Contact linguistics / Linguistique de Contact*. Berlin and NY: Walter de Gruyter. 541-59.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1972. On communicative competence. In Janet Holmes and John Pride, eds. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth. 269-93.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1972. Models of the interaction of language and social life. In John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston. 35-71.
- Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1981. Implementation of a bilingual instructional model: The new concurrent approach. In Raymond V. Padilla, ed. *Bilingual education technology*. 14-29.

- Jacobson, Rodolfo, ed. 1990. *Codeswitching as a worldwide phenomenon*. NY: Peter Lang.
- Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1990. Allocating two languages as a key feature of a bilingual methodology. In Rodolfo Jacobson & Christian Faltis, eds. *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling*. Cleveland: Multilingual Matters. 3-17.
- Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1998. Conveying a broader message through bilingual discourse: An attempt at contrastive codeswitching research. In Rodolfo Jacobson, ed. *Codeswitching Worldwide*. Trends in Linguistics 106. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 51-76.
- Jake, Janice L. 1994. Intrasentential CS and pronouns: On the categorical status of functional elements. *Linguistics* 32: 271-98.
- Jake, Janice L. and Carol Myers-Scotton. 1997. CS and compromise strategies: Implications for lexical structure. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 1: 25-39.
- Johnson, Karen E. 1995. *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Kramsch, Claire. 1981. *Discourse analysis and second language teaching*. Language in education: Theory and Practice 37. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Kramsch, Claire. 1985. Classroom interaction and discourse options. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 7: 169-83.
- Kramsch, Claire. 1987. Socialization and literacy in a foreign language: Learning through interaction. *Theory into Practice* 26: 243-57.
- Kramsch, Claire. 1996. The privilege of the non-native speaker. *PMLA*. 359-369.
- Kramsch, Claire. 1996. Wem gehört die deutsche Sprache? *Unterrichtspraxis* 29: 1-11.
- Legenhausen, Lienhard. 1991. Code-switching in learners' discourse. *IRAL* 29: 61-73.

- Li Wei. 1998. The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In Peter Auer, ed. *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London and New York: Routledge. 156-76.
- Liehr, Harald S. 1994. Muttersprachler als Sprachlehrer: Chancen und Risiken. *Unterrichtspraxis* 27: 43-49.
- Loban, Walter. 1996. *Language ability: Grades seven, eight and nine*. Cooperative Research 18. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Loveday, Leo. 1982. *Sociolinguistics of using and learning non-native languages*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Macaro, Ernesto. 2001. Analyzing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *Modern Language Journal* 85: 531-48.
- Mackey, William F. 1970. The description of bilingualism. In Joshua A. Fischman, ed. *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hague: Mouton. 554-584.
- Markee, Numa. 2000. *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Martin-Jones, Marilyn. 1995. Code-switching in the classroom: Two decades of research. In Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken, eds. *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*.
- Martin-Jones, Marilyn. 2000. Bilingual classroom research: A review of recent research. *Language Teaching* 33: 1-9.
- Matthey, Marinette and Moore, Daniele. 1997. Alternance des langues en classe: Pratiques et représentations dans deux situations d'immersion. *Travaux neuchâtois de linguistique (TRANEL)* 27, 63-82.
- Mehan, Hugh. 1979. *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Mehan, Hugh. 1985. The structure of classroom discourse. In Teun A. Van Dijk, ed. *Handbook of discourse analysis. Volume 3: Discourse and dialogue*. London: Academic.

- Merritt, Marilyn, with Ailie Bleghorn, Jared O. Abagi and Grace Bunyi. 1992. Socialising multilingualism: Determinants of codeswitching in Kenyan primary classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13: 103-21.
- Milk, Robert D. 1989. Sociolinguistic competence of non-native teachers of English as a foreign language. *Sociolinguistics* 18: 51-63.
- Milroy, Leslie. 1987. *Observing and analyzing natural language: A critical account of sociolinguistic method*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Milroy, Leslie, and Pieter Muysken, eds. 1995. *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on codeswitching*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Moffatt, Suzanne. 1991. Becoming bilingual in the classroom: Code choice in school. *Language and Education* 5: 55-71.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1997. Codeswitching processes: Alternation, insertion, congruent lexicalization. In Martin Pütz, ed. *Language choices: Conditions, constraints, and consequences*. 361-380.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1987. Code switching and types of multilingual communities. *Georgetown University Roundtable 1987. Language spread and language policy*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown UP.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1988. Code switching as indexical of social negotiations. In Monica Heller, ed. *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1989. Codeswitching with English: Types of switching, types of communities. *World Englishes* 8: 333-46.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1990. Codeswitching and borrowing: Interpersonal and macrolevel meaning. In Rodolfo Jacobson, ed. *Codeswitching as a worldwide phenomenon*. NY: Peter Lang.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1992. Comparing codeswitching and borrowing. In: Carol Eastman, ed. *Codeswitching*. Special issue of *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 19-40.

- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993a. *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993b. Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Language in Society*, 22, 475-503.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1998. Structural uniformities vs. community differences in codeswitching. In Rodolfo Jacobson, ed. *Codeswitching Worldwide*. Trends in Linguistics 106. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 91-108.\
- Nelde, Peter, ed. 1980. *Languages in contact and in conflict*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Niĳegorodcew, Anna. 1996. The function of the native language in foreign language teacher-learner interaction. *Jyvaskyla Cross Language Studies* 17: 209-214.
- Nunan, David. 1992. Sociocultural aspects of second language acquisition. *Cross Currents* 19: 13-24.
- Ogane, Ethel. 1997. Codeswitching in EFL Learner Discourse. *JALT Journal*: 19: 106-122.
- Omaggio, Alice C. 1986. *Teaching language in context: Proficiency-oriented instruction*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Pfaff, Carol. 1979. Constraints on language mixing: Intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English. *Language* 55: 291-318.
- Pfaff, Carol. 1997. Contacts and conflicts: Perspectives from codeswitching research. In Martin Pütz, ed. *Language choices? Conditions, constraints, and consequences*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 361-80.
- Pica, Teresa. 1987. Second-language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 8: 3-21.
- Piasecka, Krystyna. 1988. The bilingual teacher in the ESL classroom. In Sandra Nicholls and Elizabeth Hoadley-Maidment, eds. *Current issues in teaching English as a second language to adults*. London: Edward Arnold. 97-107.

- Polio, Charlene G. and Duff, Patricia A. 1994. Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal* 78, 313-26.
- Poplack, Shana. 1981. Syntactic structure and social functions of codeswitching. In Richard P. Duran, ed. *Latino language and communicative behavior*. Norwood NJ: Ablex. 169-184.
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of codeswitching. *Linguistics* 18: 581-618.
- Poplack, Shana. 1988. Codeswitching. In Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus Mattheier, eds. *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1174-80.
- Poplack, Shana. 1988. Contrasting patterns of codeswitching in two communities. In Monica Heller, ed. *Codeswitching: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 215-44.
- Poullisse, Nanda, and Bongaerts, Theo. 1994. First language use in second language production. *Applied Linguistics* 15: 36-57.
- Preston, Dennis. 1986. Sociolinguistics and foreign language teaching and learning. In G. Nickel and J.C. Stalker, eds. *Problems of standardization and linguistic variation of present-day English*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos. 5-24.
- Preston, Dennis. 1989. *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Psathas, George. 1995. *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Qualitative Research Methods 35. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Pütz, Martin. 1994. *Language contact and language conflict*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Rampton, B. 1995. *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rolin-Ianziti, Jeanne, and Siobhan Brownlie. 2002. Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 58: 402-26.

- Romaine, Suzanne. 1994. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Salmons, Joseph. 1990. Bilingual discourse markers: Codeswitching, borrowing and convergence in some German-American dialects. *Linguistics* 28: 453-480.
- Sarangi, Srikant. 1998. 'I actually turn my back on (some) students': The metacommunicative role of talk in classroom discourse. *Language Awareness* 7: 90-108.
- Schiffin, Deborah. 1996. Interactional sociolinguistics. In Sandra Lee McKay and Nancy H. Hornberger, eds. *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 307-28.
- Schiffin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Schiffin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Seedhouse, Paul. 1994. Linking pedagogical purposes to linguistic patterns of interaction: The analysis of communication in the language classroom. *IRAL* 32: 303-319.
- Siegel, Jeff. 1995. How to get a laugh in Fijian: Code-switching and humor. *Language in Society* 24: 95-110.
- Sridhar, Kamal K. 1996. Societal multilingualism. In Sandra Lee McKay and Nancy H. Hornberger, eds. *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 47-70.
- Stevenson, Patrick, ed. 1995. *The German language and the real world: Sociolinguistic, cultural and pragmatic perspectives on contemporary German*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1989. *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Tarone, Elaine and Merrill Swain. 1995. A sociolinguistic perspective on second language use in immersion classrooms. *Modern Language Journal* 79: 166-178.
- Tay, Mary W. J. 1989. CS and code mixing as a communicative strategy in multilingual discourse. *World Englishes* 8: 407-418.

- Timm, L.A. 1975. Spanish-English codeswitching: El porqué y how-not-to. *Romance Philology* 28: 473-82.
- Treffers-Daller, Jeanine. 1991. Toward a uniform approach to codeswitching and borrowing. In *Papers for the workshop on constraints, conditions and models*. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation. 259-79.
- Treffers-Daller, Jeanine. 1992. French-Dutch codeswitching in Brussels: Social factors explaining its disappearance. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13: 143-56.
- Treffers-Daller, Jeanine. 1998. Variability in code-switching styles: Turkish-German code-switching patterns. In Rodolfo Jacobson, ed. *Codeswitching Worldwide*. Trends in Linguistics 106. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 177-198.
- Turnbull, Miles. 2001. There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *Canadian Modern Language Journal* 57: 531-40.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1968. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 1981. Tá bien, you could answer me *en cualquier idioma*: Puerto Rican codeswitching in bilingual classrooms. In R. P. Duran, ed. *Latino language and communication behavior*. Norwood, NJ: ABLEX. 109-31.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 1990. Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods in the study of bilingual code switching. In Edward H. Bendix, ed. *Uses of Linguistics*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 583.
- Zéphir, Flore, and Marie-Magdeleine Chirol. 1993. Attitudes of teaching assistants and students toward the exclusive use of the target language in beginning French classes. In David P. Benseler, ed. *The Dynamics of Language Program Direction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle. 241-63.
- Zulu, Nogwaja S. 1996. Codeswitching or no codeswitching: What is the answer? *Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig/Journal for Language Teaching* 30: 104-110.
- Zuengler, Jane. 1991. Accomodation in native-nonnative interactions: Going beyond the “what” to the “why” in second-language research. In Howard Giles, Justine Coupland and Nikolas Coupland, eds. *Contexts of*

accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 223-44.

Vita

Lisa Michelle Seidlitz was born to Paul and Judith Seidlitz in St. Charles, IL on December 24, 1969. She attended Reskin Elementary School and Marquardt Middle School in Glendale Heights, IL and Glenbard East High School in Lombard, IL. She earned a bachelor's degree in Germanic Languages and Literatures at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1991; she earned a master's degree in Germanic Languages and Literatures from the same institution in 1994. During this time, she spent a year studying at the University of Heidelberg, Germany. In 1995, she transferred to the department of Germanic Studies at the University of Texas at Austin, earning her Ph.D. there in 2003. During her time at the University of Texas, she spent a year studying at the Free University of Berlin, Germany. Throughout her graduate career, she has taught language courses at the university and community college levels.

Permanent address: 1203 Edgewood Ave, Austin, TX 78722

This dissertation was typed by the author.