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Abstract

There are more languages than the number of countries all over the world. This causes the existence of multilingualism in which a group of society can speak more than one language. Somehow, in the middle of the speech, a speaker unintentionally and intentionally changes their language to the other language to highlight the speech or to make it easier to understand. Hence this paper reviews research findings on one of the key issues to which language contact in an educational setting has given rise, namely, the rationale for codeswitching practices in language acquisition. This is a library research presented in descriptive qualitative data. The data are taken from related literatures and observations. In particular, it reports on why bilingual teachers and students sometimes resort to codeswitching, and whether classroom codeswitching is an impediment or a resource to learning.
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Introduction

Multilingualism is to be expected as a very common phenomenon all over the world, considering that there are almost 7,000 languages and about 200 independent countries all over the world (Lewis, 2011). It happens because not only there are more languages than countries but also that the number of speakers of the different languages is unevenly distributed in their daily life. Multilinguals speaker can be those of minority indigenous language (e.g Gayo in Indonesia, Dayak in Malaysia) who need to learn the dominant state language.

In other cases, multilinguals are immigrant who speak their first languages as well as the target languages or language of their host countries. To be related, languages are learned and spread internationally and it is considered as that they open doors for better economic and social opportunities. Currently this is the case of English, which is the most widespread language and is commonly used as a school subject as well as a language instruction in school and universities all over the world (Kirkpatrick & Sussex, 2012). Since this is a complex phenomenon, it can be studied from different perspectives in diciplines such as linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and education. Hence this paper will focus on the perspectives of sociolinguistics which is cannot be separated from the use of codeswitching in a converstion.

Codeswitching deals with the intersentential alternating use of two or more languages or varieties of a language in the same speech situation. Over the past 30 years, codeswitching has been one of the most researched topics in sociolinguistics (Rubdy, 2007; Heller, 2008; Jacobson, 2010; Blom & Gumperz, 2012; Ferguson, 2013; Myers-Scotton, 2013; Kachru, 2018; Kamwangamalu & Lee, 2019). Especialy in multilingual society, the use of codeswitching appears more than twice in a single sentence.

A related term, codemixing, refers to the intrasentential alternating use of two or more languages or varieties of a language and is often used in studies of grammatical aspects of bilingual speech (Muysken, 2010; Poplack & Meechan, 2015). Grammatical studies of codemixing are concerned with, among other things, determining the types (e.g. nouns, verbs, etc.) of codemixing patterns that occur often in bilingual speech and why; investigating whether codemixing is syntactically random or rule governed;
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and exploring whether the rules or constraints that govern codemixing are universal or language-specific.

Traditionally a distinction is made between codemixing and codeswitching, however current literature generally uses the term codeswitching, and this will be the case in the rest of this paper, as a cover term for all instances of bilingual language alternation, whether intra or intersentential. Auer (2015) refers codeswitching as the alternating use of two or more languages as code alternation. He uses the term code alternation to cover ‘all cases in which semiotic systems are put in a relationship of contiguous juxtaposition, such that the appropriate recipients of the resulting complex sign are in a position to interpret this juxtaposition as such’ (Auer, 2015: 116).

Gumperz (2012) remarks that code alternation is one kind of contextualization cue. Contextualization cues are constellations of surface features of message form by which speakers signal and listeners interpret what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows (Gumperz, 2012: 131). Codeswitching signals contextual information equivalent to what in monolingual settings is conveyed through prosody or other syntactic or lexical processes. It generates the presuppositions in terms of which the context of what is said is decoded (Gumperz, 2012: 98). Codeswitching, henceforth CS, is a by product of language contact. As Haugen (2012) observes, when two or more languages come into contact, as is the case in multilingual communities around the world, they tend to color one another. This coloring has termed interlingual contagion, manifests itself in language contact phenomena such as CS, borrowing, code-crossing, diglossia, language shift, to name but a few (Haugen, 2012).

CS is different from the other language contact phenomena in many respects. Then it goes on to review some of the perspectives from which CS has been investigated to provide the reader with a broader view of CS, namely the interactional, markedness and political ideological approaches. Following that, it is required to highlight findings on: Why do bilingual teachers and students sometime use CS in the classroom? This will be followed by a discussion of the implications of CS classroom for the English only argument in Indonesia, as well as in ESL/EFL classrooms worldwide. **Codeswitching, Borrowing and Language Shift**

Borrowing across languages is defined with reference to the ‘end product’ rather than the process (Kamwangamalu, 2010: 296). Gumperz
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(2012: 66) defines borrowing as the introduction of single words or short, frozen, idiomatic phrases from one language into another. The lexical items in columns A and B below, for instance, are examples of borrowings from English into two Indonesian and Malay languages, respectively. Indonesian language is the national language of Indonesia and is spoken as first language by about 267.7 million people. Malay language is the national language of Malaysia and is spoken by about 31.53 million people as first language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Indonesian language</th>
<th>B. Malay language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aktor ‘actor’</td>
<td>bambu ‘bamboo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bom ‘bomb’</td>
<td>kati ‘caddy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kartun ‘cartoon’</td>
<td>kesuari ‘cassowary’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detektif ‘detective’</td>
<td>geko ‘gecko’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fesyen ‘fashion’</td>
<td>pantun ‘pantoum’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These items provide support for the view that when a linguistic item is borrowed, it is integrated, phonologically, morphologically and syntactically, into the grammatical system of the borrowing language (Poplack, 2008). In some cases, however, the borrowed items may resist integration. Poplack (2008) calls such items ‘nonce borrowings’, and defines them as linguistic items from one language (e.g., French) used in discourse in the other language (e.g., English) which do not show any adaptation, at least in their written form, to the linguistic system of the borrowing language. Examples of nonce borrowings include English phrases such as ‘charge d’affaires, déja vu, comme ci, comme ça’ and lexical items such as chauffeur, coiffeur, etc., all of which are borrowings from French. It is worth noting that despite their lack of adaptation, in terms of social integration (Hasselmo, 2012: 180), nonce borrowings are a part and parcel of the linguistic system of the borrowing language. Hasselmo (2012) uses the term social integration to refer to the degrees of consistency, regularity, and frequency with which linguistic items from one language are used in discourse in the other language.

Borrowing, whether nonce or integrated, does not require or presuppose any degree of competence in two languages, but CS does. Put differently, borrowing can occur in the speech of both monolingual and bilingual speakers alike; however, CS is strictly speaking a characteristic feature of the linguistic behavior of bilingual speakers. Also, in terms of
function, generally speakers use borrowing to fill lexical gaps in their languages. However, they engage in CS for a variety of reasons, such as the following: to express in group solidarity, to exclude someone from a conversation by switching to a language the person does not understand, to emphasize a point by repeating it in two languages, etc. (Myers-Scotton, 2013; Finlayson & Slabbert, 2017). Further, unlike borrowing, CS can lead to the formation of mixed language varieties including pidgins (e.g. fanagalo and Tsotsitaal in South Africa, pidgin English in Nigeria) and creoles (e.g. Franglais in Mauritius, Haitian creole) or to language shift (Myers-Scotton, 2013).

Concerning language shift, Fasold (2014) explains that it is a gradual process in which a speech community, for one reason or another, gives up its language and adopts a new one. The process of language shift, as Fishman (2011) puts it, refers particularly to ‘speech communities whose native languages are threatened because their intergenerational continuity is proceeding negatively, with fewer and fewer users or uses every generation’ (Fishman, 2011: 1). Over the past few years, Kamwangamalu (2010) had informally observed language shift as it happens in immigrant African families in the Washington DC area. It seemed that soon after they arrive in the United States younger African children in particular become bilingual in English and their original African language. However, it does not take long before they start speaking English only, especially when interacting with peers or with siblings. As Romaine (2014) notes, the starting point of language shift is bilingualism, often accompanied by diglossia, as a stage on the way to monolingualism in a new language, in this case English. Romaine (2014) explains that ‘typically, a community which was once monolingual becomes bilingual as a result of contact with another (usually socially and economically more powerful) group and becomes transitionally bilingual in the new language until their own language is given up altogether’ (Romaine, 1994: 50).

**Codeswitching and Diglossia**

The concept of diglossia has received considerable attention in the literature over the years (Ferguson, 2013; Fishman, 2011; Schiffman, 2017). Ferguson (2013) uses the term diglossia to refer to a situation where two genetically related varieties of a language, one identified as the H(igh) (or standard) variety and the other as the L(ow) (i.e. nonstandard) variety, have clearly distinct functions in the community. Ferguson (2013: 236) notes that the H variety is used in formal settings, whereas the L variety is used in
informal interactions. More specifically, the H variety is used, for instance, for giving sermons in mosques or churches, speeches in the parliament, formal lectures at universities, broadcasting the news on radio and television and for writing editorials in newspapers. In contrast, it is observed that the L variety is used for giving instructions to servants, waiters, workers and clerks; in conversations with family, friends and colleagues; and in folk literature and soap operas on the radio.

According to Ferguson (2013), anyone who uses H while engaged in an informal activity like shopping, or who uses L during a formal activity like a parliamentary debate, runs the risk of ridicule. Generally, H is learnt at school, while L is more spontaneously acquired in informal settings. H is generally perceived as more aesthetically pleasing and beautiful, and has more prestige than L. H has a literary tradition, whereas L does not. And if there does exist a body of literature in L, it is usually written by foreigners rather than by native speakers. Taking the above characteristic features of diglossia into account, Ferguson defines diglossia as:

“a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation.” (Ferguson, 2013: 245)

Although Ferguson’s definition of diglossia is concerned specifically with two varieties (H and L) of the same language, Fishman (2011: 75) has extended the definition to include situations where two genetically unrelated languages are used in the community, one in formal settings and the other in informal settings. This extended or broad diglossia as it has come to be known, best describes the relationship that holds among languages, especially in multilingual post colonial settings (Kamwangamalu, 2010: 103). In such settings, former colonial languages, for instance French, Portuguese, Spanish and English in Africa; English in parts of Asia (e.g. the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, etc.) and Spanish and Portuguese in Latin America, coexist with local languages in a diglossic relationship, where the
ex colonial language is the H language and the local languages are the L languages.

Most studies of diglossia have, expectedly, focused on the functional dependency or complementarity between the participating languages, arguing that where one language is used the other is not and vice versa. For instance, in his study of vernacular–Swahili–English triglossia in Tanzania, Mkilifi (2008) describes the functional distribution of the three languages, pointing out that each of the languages is assigned to certain domains in the community: the vernacular is used as an intra group language and is associated with rural African culture-related activities; Kiswahili is associated with pre-industrial, non technological urban type of African culture; English is associated with technology and official business. Wald (2016) makes a similar point about Yakoma and Sango in the Central African Republic, noting that the former is the L language and the latter is the H language.

However, in spite of the strict compartmentalization of languages that is at the heart of the concept of diglossia, research shows that CS involving H and L is widespread in multilingual communities around the world (MacSwan, 2000; Proshina & Ettkin, 2005; Watkhaolarm, 2005; Heller, 2008; Jacobson, 2010; Blom & Gumperz, 2012; Auer, 2015; Kachru, 2018). Also, there is evidence that CS can and does occur in any domain of language use, formal (including the classroom) or informal; its occurrence in either domain is determined by variables of the context of situation, especially the topic and the interlocutors (Bamiro, 2006; Martin-Jones, 2015; Li, 2018). And yet, it seems that the relationship between CS and diglossia in a formal context such as the classroom has hardly been explored. This constitutes a fertile area for further research into CS. Also, the very fact that CS can occur in a formal domain such as the classroom calls for a redefinition of diglossia, for modern language practices in multilingual communities around the world are at odds with the premise on which diglossia is based, namely, strict functional compartmentalization of languages.

**Codeswitching and Code-crossing**

Earlier it was pointed out that CS is a contextualization cue in the sense Gumperz (2012) defines. Related to CS as a contextualization cue is what Ben Rampton has termed code-crossing, a concept that is central to Rampton’s book titled *Crossing*. Rampton describes code-crossing as ‘code alternation by people who are not accepted members of the group associated with the second language they employ. It is concerned with switching into
languages that are not generally thought to belong to you’ (Rampton, 2015: 280). An example of this phenomenon would be, in the case of the United States, a non-African American rapper using African American Vernacular English, a variety with which the artist may not be associated in the wider American society. CS differs from code-crossing in many respects. First, code-crossing is an out-group phenomenon; but CS is an in-group phenomenon, restricted to those who share the same expectations and rules of interpretation for the use of the two languages. Usually it is seen as a device used to affirm participants’ claims to membership and the solidarity of the group in contrast to outsiders’ (Woolard, 2018: 69–70).

Second, the difference between in-group CS and out-group code-crossing, argues Rampton (2015: 282), resides in the fact that in in-group practice, both languages can also be used in the unexceptional conduct of everyday life. Code-crossing, however, does not have this flexibility: ‘the code-alternation it entails is much more likely to be “flagged” (e.g., marked by pauses, hesitation phenomena, repetition and metalinguistic commentary)’ (Rampton, 2015: 282).

Third, unlike CS, code-crossing involves a disjunction between a speaker and code that cannot be readily accommodated as a normal part of ordinary social reality (Rampton, 2015: 283). However, whatever code or language is selected not only carries social meaning (Rampton, 2015: 284), but it is also prestigious and powerful (Rampton, 2015: 286).

Fourth, unlike CS, code-crossing bears the distinctive characteristic of being always marked in the sense Myers-Scotton (2013) defines, that is, it always entails use of the least expected language or language variety in a given linguistic interaction. Finally, the occurrence of CS in bilinguals’ interactions presupposes no violation of the norms that govern language use in the community of which the participants are members. In code-crossing, however, the speaker may choose to challenge these norms by diverging from the ‘referee’ and converging toward the audience, namely the addressee. In this regard, the ‘audience’ may have more than one circle. While in every interaction there is a second person whom the speaker directly addresses – the addressee – in some instances, there may also be third parties who, though not physically present, are actually ratified participants of the interaction. As noted elsewhere (Kamwngamalu, 2010: 90), these third
parties or the referee as Bell calls them, sometimes possess such salience for a speaker that they influence his/her speech even in their absence. This influence can be so great that the speaker diverges from the addressee and converges toward the ‘referee’. Despite the differences outlined above between CS and code-crossing, both phenomena are, again, contextualization cues as defined in Gumperz (2012). As such, they can serve as acts of identity: through them the speaker may ‘project his/her inner universe, implicitly with the invitation to others to share it, at least insofar as they recognize his/her language as an accurate symbolization of the world, and to share his/her attitudes towards it’ (Le Page & Tabouret Keller, 2015: 181). Having discussed the difference between CS and related language contact phenomena such as borrowing, language shift, diglossia and codecrossing, the following section discusses briefly some of the approaches from which CS has been studied. It aims to underscore the fact that classroom language practices are a microcosm of language practices in the wider bilingual or multilingual society.

**Method**

The design of this research was library research presented in descriptive qualitative data. It aims to give some explanations and comparisons about the existing theories. The data are taken from related literatures and observations. In particular, it reports on why bilingual teachers and students sometimes resort to codeswitching, and whether classroom codeswitching is an impediment or a resource to learning.

**Discussion**

This section discusses the approaches to codeswitching. CS has been investigated from a number of approaches, among them grammatical, psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic approaches. The goal of grammatical approaches to CS has been presented previously. Psycholinguistic approaches to CS explore, among other issues, how CS sentences are processed, whether CS sentences take longer to process than monolingual sentences, whether CS derives from the interaction of monolingual grammars or from a separate grammar, the so called third or CS grammar (Costa, 2014; Lederberg & Morales, 2015).

Sociolinguistic approaches to CS seek to determine why bilingual speakers sometime engage in CS. This section concentrates on the latter approaches, for they provide the background against which classroom CS can be understood better. Some of the approaches to be discussed below.
include the interactional approach (Gumperz, 2012), the markedness approach (Myers-Scotton, 2013) and the political–ideological approach (Heller, 2008).

The interactional approach to codeswitching

The interactional approach’s focus is not so much on details of constituent structure but rather on the social meaning of CS and, as Milroy and Muysken (2015: 9) note, on the discourse and interactional functions that CS performs for speakers. In this approach, CS is viewed as a contextualization cue, as Gumperz (2012) defines. Myers-Scotton (2013: 57) comments that within the interactional approach, speakers are understood to use language in the way they do not simply because of their social identities or because of other factors. Rather, they exploit the possibility of linguistic choices in order to convey intentional meaning of a sociopragmatic nature. Code choices then, including CS, are not just choices of content, but are discourse strategies.

Gumperz’s interactional approach to CS is mostly known for the distinction it makes between situational codeswitching and metaphorical codeswitching. A parallel distinction can be found in Oksaar (2012: 492), who uses the terms external codeswitching and internal codeswitching, or in Jacobson (2018), who distinguishes between sociologically conditioned codeswitching and psychologically conditioned codeswitching. Situational CS (i.e. external or sociologically conditioned CS) has to do with the social factors that trigger CS, such as the participants, the topic, and the setting. The bilingual’s code choice is partly dependent on them. Metaphorical CS (i.e. internal or psychologically conditioned CS) concerns language fac-tors, especially the speaker’s fluency and his/her ability to use various emotive devices.

The Gumperz approach has been criticized for its taxonomic view of CS (Myers-Scotton, 2013: 52–55), which consists in listing the functions of CS in a particular speech situation. The criticism stems from the fact that language is dynamic. Not a single individual speaks the same way all the time, nor does anyone, including monolinguals, use a single register or style in every speech situation. Also, there are a variety of domains, topics and situations in which bilingual speakers may use CS. Therefore, listing the
functions of CS, as the Gumperz approach does, distracts from the search for generalizations on the functions of CS in multilingual societies.

Notwithstanding these criticisms, Gumperz’ approach supports the idea, documented by many scholars including Gumperz himself, that CS is not meaningless or a deficit to be stigmatized. Rather, it can and does indeed serve a wide range of functions in bilingual interactions, such as to express modernization, confidentiality, solidarity or in-groupness identity, sympathy and intimacy, to list a few (Gumperz, 1982; Kachru, 2018).

The markedness approach to codeswitching

The markedness approach has evolved from Myers-Scotton’s research into CS in East Africa, especially in Kenya. The main claim of this approach is that all linguistic choices, including CS, are indices of social negotiations of rights and obligations existing between participants in a conversational exchange (Myers-Scotton, 2013: 152–153). These rights and obligations are said to derive from whatever situational features are salient to the exchange, such as the status of the participants, the topic and the setting. It is the interplay between these features and more dynamic, individual considerations that determines the linguistic choices that individuals make about media for conversational exchanges.

The markedness approach predicts CS as a realization of one of the following three types of negotiations (Myers-Scotton, 2013: 156). First, in conventionalized exchanges, CS may be an unmarked choice between peers, unmarked in the sense that it is the expected choice for the exchange in question and its use signals solidarity and in groupness identity amongst the participants. Second, with any participants in such exchanges CS may be a marked choice, that is, it is the unexpected choice in that exchange and therefore signals social distance amongst the participants. Third, in no conventionalized exchanges or uncertain situations, CS is an exploratory choice presenting multiple identities. It is explained that in these situations, since there is no apparent unmarked choice, speakers nominate an exploratory choice as the basis for the exchange. In other words, speakers ‘negotiate’ one code first as a medium for the exchange and, depending upon the outcome of the negotiation, they may negotiate another code until they are satisfied that they have reached the balance of rights and obligations required for that particular conversational exchange.

The markedness approach has indeed contributed significantly to our understanding of why bilingual speakers uses their languages the way they do in their communities. However, it has been criticized for being too static.
to account for the social motivations for CS across languages and cultures (Kamwangamalu, 2016). Consider, for instance, the following conversation between a lecturer and her students in a lecture room at the University of Sebelas Maret, Surakarta Central Java. The lecturer (a native speaker) negotiates an early date for a test with her students, but the students would prefer to write the test later because they have already committed to writing tests for other courses. Not to challenge the lecturer openly, one student switches to Javanese in appealing to fellow students for support against writing the test sooner. The student uses Javanese so that the lecturer, not a Javanese speaker herself, would not understand what the student is saying. Following the markedness approach, the switch from English to Javanese is clearly a marked choice intended to create distance between the lecturer and the students, for Javanese is the least expected medium of communication in a University lecture room, especially if the parties involved all do not share this language. Note, however, that from the speaker’s perspective, CS to Javanese also qualifies as an unmarked choice, for it is intended to create solidarity between the speaker and her fellow students. What this means is that CS as a marked choice can be a double-edged sword: it can simultaneously exclude and include; it can create rapprochement and distance, much as it can reinforce the weness versus the otherness among the participants in a conversational exchange.

**Javanese-English CS** (Dipta, 2015)

**Lecturer:** What if I gave you a short test tomorrow.

**Students:** No, Mam, tomorrow we are writing a test for another course.

**Lecturer:** When do you think we can write it? We should definitely have one this week.

One student (turning to his fellow students):

*He cah! Ojo do gele lumtukugge iki yo. Mosok iyo saben minggu adewe kudu ngerjakno tugase deknen rumangsane adewe mung njupuk mata kuliah iki tok to yo* (Translation: Hey, guys! Never agree to write the test! Every week we write her tests as if this is the only course, we are taking this term)

**Lecturer (to the student who was addressing his classmates):** What are you saying?

**The Student:** I’m saying, Mam, what if we write it next week.

[The rest of the class laughs]
This example of Javanesse-English classroom CS shows clearly that CS as a marked choice does not necessarily or always entail social distance among the participants. This point holds also for CS as a marked choice in other formal settings, such as political rallies, church services, etc. For instance, when politicians use CS at public rallies or in formal meetings, their aim is not so much to distance themselves from their audiences or addressees. Rather, they use CS to create an opposite, no matter how symbolic, effect: rapprochement, oneness and solidarity with their audiences.

Internationally, other examples of CS as a marked choice include cases discussed in Kamwangamalu (2010: 291–292): Koffi Annan’s use of French-English CS in his 1997 maiden speech at the UN to seek rapprochement with the French, who had reportedly opposed his candidacy as UN Secretary General; Nelson Mandela’s use of Afrikaans-English CS at meetings with the Afrikaners while negotiating the end of apartheid in South Africa; a Zimbabwe mayor’s use of Ndebele-English CS in the legislature. Contrary to the predictions of the markedness approach to CS, the unexpected (i.e. marked) use of French, Afrikaans and Ndebele, respectively in these cases is clearly intended to create rapprochement rather than distance between the speakers and their audiences.

A similar criticism of the staticness of the markedness approach to CS can be found in Meeuwis and Blommaert (2014). In particular, they call into question the key claim of the markedness approach that the negotiation of identities, rights and obligations is the explanation for all the uses, functions and meanings of CS in every CS society. Specifically, they are very critical of what they call ‘the disappearance of ethnographic specificity’ in Myers-Scotton’s approach to CS. In their view, Myers-Scotton (2013: 412) neglects ethnographic description because of ‘her ambitions to postulate innateness and universality as the level at which CS should be explained’. In making a ‘quantum leap over and beyond ethnography’, the markedness approach is a social and fails to account for the community specific empirical facts that account for most of the social in communication.

Indeed, one cannot explain the function of CS in bilingual or multilingual societies solely in terms of the negotiation of identities in interpersonal communication, for, as we will see below in the discussion of the ideological–political approach, CS is sometimes used for political gains (Heller, 2012). Nevertheless, there seems to be no justification in Meeuwis and Blommaert’s describing as a-social a theory, the markedness theory, which attempts to account for the social motivations for CS.
The political–ideological approach to codeswitching

While Myers-Scotton maintains that all linguistic choices including CS are indexical of social negotiations of rights and obligations, there are studies of code choice in which the political and language–ideological dimensions of CS are stressed (Heller, 2012; Kamwangamalu, 2010; Lin, 2016). In these studies, CS is seen as a point of entry into the exploration of processes whereby dominant groups use conventions of language choice to maintain relations of power, while subordinate groups may (at times simultaneously) acquiesce to, resist or even exploit conventions of language choice to redefine them (Heller, 2012). Accordingly, CS is seen as linguistic capital and one of the powerful and potentially effective strategies that people have at their disposal and that they use to achieve pre-determined social goals, such as exercise power over others or identify with certain groups for political gains (e.g. votes). The distribution of this capital in the community is related in specific ways to the distribution of other forms of capital (e.g. economic capital, cultural capital, etc.) that define the location of an individual within the social space (Bourdieu, 2011).

In some communities the linguistic capital itself may, as Bourdieu (2011) notes with regard to Fabian’s (2012) study of French Swahili CS in former Zaire, now the Democratic Republic of Congo, be the locus par excellence of conflict and contest in language. In his study, Fabian documents resistance against ‘standard’ norms of communication, noting that neither the ‘standard’ nor the ‘heretic’ is neutral: both are political instruments either at the service of hegemony or at the service of resistance to this hegemony. Similarly, Heller’s (2012) study of language choice and French-English CS in Quebec, Canada, reveals that like Fabian’s study, CS is not arbitrary but concerns relations of power – different ways of seeing the world in struggle with each other. The individuals who participate in this struggle are said to have different aims – some will seek to preserve the status quo, others to change it – and differing chances of winning or losing, depending upon where they are located in the structured space of their respective positions in society (Bourdieu, 2011). Heller (2012: 140) concludes in her study that ‘in order to understand the role and significance of CS, it is essential to understand not only its distribution in the community, but also how that distribution is tied to the way groups control both the
distribution of access to valued resources and the way in which that value is assigned’. In this regard, Bourdieu (2011) theorizes that people make choices about what languages to use in particular kinds of markets, which he defines as places where different kinds of resources or capital are distributed. Multilingual classrooms represent one such market where decisions about language choice are made. The following section is highlighted key findings on why bilingual teachers and students sometime choose to use CS in this particular market, the classroom.

**Pedagogical Motivations for Codeswitching**

Classroom CS entails simultaneous use of two languages including a target language (L2) such as English and students’ first language (L1), or of two varieties of the target language, one standard and one nonstandard, for classroom interaction and instructional exchanges. The use of both Javanese English and Standard American English in the classroom, for instance English. The pre observation indicates that some teachers support the promotion of Javanese as a variety of English in its own right; but others oppose it in favor of Standard American English (Rinda, 2015). This issue is discussed later in the implications of classroom CS for the (Standard) English-only argument in Indonesia, as well as in English-medium or ESL/EFL classrooms worldwide.

CS involving L1 and L2 in education has been documented in many countries around the world, for example Edstrom (2016), Franquiz and del Carmen (2014) and Flowers (2010) in the United States; Arthur (2011) in Botswana and Tanzania; Merritt et al. (2012) and Bunyi (2018) in Kenya; Peires (2014) in South Africa; Canagarajah (2015) in Sri Lanka; Rubdy (2017) in Singapore; Lin (2016) in Hong Kong; Liu et al. (2014) in Korea; Slotte-Luttge (2017) in Finland; etc. The central quest of this research has been to explain why bilingual teachers and students use CS in the classroom and especially whether classroom CS is an impediment or a resource to learning. Those literatures have shown that classroom CS is not detrimental to the acquisition of the target language or variety. Rubdy (2017: 320) notes that on the contrary and far from being a dysfunctional form of speech behavior, as some educational authorities have implied, classroom CS can be an important, even necessary, communicative resource for the management of learning.

As such, classroom CS is a teaching learning aid that can be used to meet a wide range of classroom needs, it can be used: to build rapport and provide a sense of inclusiveness (Rubdy, 2017); to compensate for a lack of
comprehension (Edstrom, 2006); to manage the classroom and transmit content (Butzkamm, 2018); to express solidarity with the students (Camilleri, 2016); to praise or scorn (Moodley, 2013), and so on. For instance, in an investigation into the use of Singlish (Singapore Colloquial English) in education in Singapore, Rubdy (2017) reports that despite the stigma with which it is associated, Singlish is more often than not used in the classroom. Indeed, the official mandate stipulates that only Singapore Standard English should be used in the classroom. However, it seems that teachers switch to Singlish because it best serves their teaching needs: it empowers them to explain difficult points or concepts, to inject humor, to establish a warmer, friendlier atmosphere in the classroom, to encourage greater student involvement, etc. (Rubdy, 2017: 314, 322).

In a similar but practitioner research study, Edstrom (2016) documents her own teaching practices using English in an otherwise Spanish classroom in the United States. In particular, the author sought to discover how much English she used in a first semester Spanish course, to identify the functions or purposes for which she used it, to compare her perceptions, and those of her students, with her actual practices, and to critique her L1/L2 use in light of her own pedagogical belief system. Edstrom reports that she found Spanish/English classroom CS useful. She used it, for instance, for grammar instruction, classroom management, and for compensating for a lack of comprehension (Edstrom, 2016: 283). Edstrom cautions teachers not to adhere blindly to a professional guideline, but rather to identify, and perhaps re-evaluate their moral obligations to their students and their objectives for the language learning process (Edstrom, 2016: 289).

Likewise, Hadjiioannou (2019: 287) remarks that instead of alienating or disenfranchising dialect speaking students by rejecting their mother tongue and stigmatizing its use in school, teachers should develop a healthier attitude toward diglossia to foster student academic success. Ferguson (2013) anticipated this point, in noting that as both members of a profession and members of the local community, teachers may wish from time to time to step out of their teachers’ persona and stress co-membership of the local vernacular community with their students. They can do so, for instance, by switching to the vernacular when they scold or praise the students. In this regard, Liu et al. (2015, cited in Rubdy, 2017: 322) argue that in an
increasingly globalized world, CS may need to be added as curriculum objective, a required life skill.

Other scholars, such as Franquiz and del Carmen (2014), make an even stronger argument in their study of language practices in the education of Mexican–American students. In particular, the authors argue that teachers should practice a humanizing pedagogy to foster healthy educational orientations for their students. A humanizing pedagogy entails ‘valuing the students’ background knowledge, culture, and life experiences, and creating learning contexts where power is shared by students and teachers. Teachers who practice a humanizing pedagogy make use of ‘the funds of cultural knowledge’ of their students’ heritage community; that is, in their literary practices such teachers focus on what students can do and achieve with the linguistic and cultural resources they bring to the class room from outside of school (Franquiz & del Carmen, 2014: 49).

It is crucial, then, that teachers reflect seriously on how they respond to the linguistic resources that their students bring to learning. As McKay (2018: 23) observes, in classrooms in multilingual contexts where the teacher shares a first language with the students, teachers need to carefully consider how they can best make use of their students’ first language to enhance their competence in a target language. The literature suggests that where teachers do not share a first language with the students, other teaching strategies, such as peer-teaching or peer-tutoring, should be employed. Peer-teaching refers to any activity involving students helping one another to understand, review, practice and remember. It entails switching to the language that the learners know best, their L1 or ‘a conversational lubricant’, and use it as a springboard for acquiring a target language. More specifically, peer-teaching involves using learners as models, sources of information, and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken by a formally trained teacher (Gaies, 2015: 131). By using peer-teaching the teacher sub-contracts, as it were, some of his prerogatives to pairs or small groups of students headed by surrogate teachers. Instructional exchanges between teachers and students or between students and students provide opportunities for learners to practice L2 skills, to test out their hypotheses about how the language works, to get useful feedback and, in short, to make ‘real attempts at communication’.

Peer-teaching, a much-publicized practice in contemporary education, has emerged as a response to the challenges and changes in the language teaching profession and to the need to make language instruction as effective
and meaningful as possible. This method of teaching attained great popularity in Britain during the early 20th century. The appeal of using children to teach other children was due to the very promising reports about the academic and social effects of tutoring programs (Gartner et al., 1971, quoted in Allen, 2016: 10). The reports showed that the tutor (the pupil teacher) and the tutee (the pupil learner) did not only gain in academic achievement, but there was also improvement in social behavior, attitudes and self-esteem as well. Also, in entrusting the tutors with the task of tutoring their less proficient classmates, the teacher acknowledges that these aides are good at what they are doing. In doing so, the teacher instills confidence in the tutors and stimulates them to work even harder in their studies. On the other hand, the tutees are constantly stimulated and perceive the level of their tutors as more easily attainable than that of native speakers, their teacher or other language models.

**The English-only Argument**

The research reviewed in the foregoing sections indicates that classroom CS is a resource rather than an impediment to learning. Very often, however, the question whether a native language or language variety should be used in the classroom has been a source of controversy and debate among applied linguists and policy makers of all persuasion, as pointed out earlier with respect to the Javanese English controversy in Indonesia.

The debate, which has come to be known as the English-only argument or Teach-English-Through-English (TETE) in Asia and in many English-medium or ESL/EFL countries worldwide, seems to be far from over (Auerbach, 2013). As Auerbach (2013: 14) notes, the proponents of the English-only argument, just like the proponents of what may be called the ‘TETE’ argument in Asia and elsewhere, claim that English is best taught monolingually, that the more English is taught, the better the results, that using students’ L1 or variety will impede the development of thinking in English, and that if other languages are used too much, standards of English will drop (Auerbach, 2013). Contrary to these claims, several studies including those cited above have shown that students’ L1 has an important role to play in an English-only classroom, especially for learners who are less proficient in the target language, English (Cook, 2001).
For example, in a study comparing academic oral interaction in TETE (i.e. English-medium) lectures and Indonesian-medium lectures, Rinda (2015: 15) reports that, due to their limited proficiency in English, students encountered more difficulty expressing themselves in TETE lectures than in Indonesian-medium lectures. It is observed that not only did the students have more difficulty with lecture comprehension and note-taking in TETE lectures than in Indonesian-medium lectures, but they also had difficulty participating in small group discussions, oral presentations, and whole class discussions in English-medium lectures (Rinda, 2015: 14). In a similar study investigating Javanese teachers’ attitude toward TETE, Rinda (2015: 68) notes that teachers experience a high degree of anxiety associated with TETE, for they themselves, like their students, have limited proficiency in English. It seems that using students’ and teachers’ L1 (i.e. Indonesian) in the classroom would help both teachers and students develop proficiency in the target language, English.

As already pointed out, research shows that L1 plays a positive role in L2 learning. For instance, Dipta (2015) provides an account of the use of learners’ L1 in accelerated ESL classroom at senior high school 2 Ponorogo, East Java. At the Center, students are allowed to start writing about their future dream in their L1. With the assistance of more proficient learners or bilingual tutors, the texts produced by the learners are translated into English, the target language. The outcome of this exercise is that it validates the learners’ lived experience, provides the learners with opportunities to experiment and take risks with English, and constitutes a natural bridge for overcoming problems of vocabulary, sentence structure and language confidence (Dipta, 2015: 72). Moreover, Rinda provides several examples of classroom CS in science lessons in junior high school 2 Madiun East Java, noting that the switch to the learners’ home language serves to render the culturally unfamiliar familiar, make the implicit explicit, provide contextualization cues, and raise learners’ metalinguistic awareness (Rinda, 2015: 25).

Requiring the students not to use their L1 in the classroom, as is customary in ESL teaching both locally and globally as well as in many EFL countries, can have a detrimental effect on the learners’ academic development. Consider, for instance, the case of Mexican–American ESL students. Research shows that a school’s attempt to assimilate young Mexican–American students into the dominant society by subtracting their language and culture has a damaging effect on the students’ academic
performance. Goldstein (2003) notes that *subtractive schooling* and that demands that students invest only in the dominant (Euro-American middle class) school culture and divests them of important social and cultural resources, leaves the Mexican–American youths vulnerable to academic failure (2003: 248). Along these lines, Ribadeneira in Auerbach (2013) points out that Spanish-speaking pupils tend to drop out of school when they are forced not to speak Spanish in the classroom because they feel that.

“[they] are treated like garbage. I kept getting suspended because when I spoke Spanish with my homeboys, the teachers thought I was disrespecting them. They kept telling me to speak in English because I was in America. I wasn’t going to take that. So I left and never went back. Some of those teachers don’t want us. That hurts, that really hurts.” (Ribadeneira, 2012, quoted in Auerbach, 2013: 9)

A similar situation exists in most post-colonial settings around the world as well. In South Africa, for instance, formerly ‘Indian’ and ‘white’ schools have admitted large numbers of African pupils who learn English as L2. Since in many of these schools English is the sole medium of instruction, students are sometimes punished or fined when they use their L1 within the school compound. Press reports indicate that ‘some school principals speak with pride about beating children to stop them speaking their native tongue’ at school (*Mail & Guardian*, July 5, 2017). Raising educators’ awareness about the resourcefulness of classroom CS should help them re-assess their attitude toward L1 and its role in L2 learning.

**Conclusion**

The previous sections have highlighted research findings on why bilingual teachers and students sometime use CS in the classroom. Research shows that classroom CS, just like CS in the wider multilingual society, is not random. Rather, teachers and students have recourse to CS to meet delineable classroom needs, such as to compensate for a lack of comprehension, encourage greater student participation, build rapport and express solidarity with the students, and so on.

It has also briefly discussed the relationship between classroom CS and other language contact phenomena such as diglossia. Here is argued that by the very definition of diglossia, CS involving an H language and an L language or variety should not occur at all in the classroom or in any other
formal context, since diglossia is premised on a strict functional compartmentalization of languages. And yet, as research has shown, CS can and does occur in any domains of language use, formal or informal; its occurrence in either domain is governed by the context of situation and the communication needs of the participants. Accordingly, the concept of diglossia needs redefining to reflect not only general language practices but also classroom language practices in multilingual communities around the world.

Finally, it has discussed the implications of classroom CS for the English-only argument in Indonesia, as well as in English medium or ESL/EFL classrooms worldwide. It was noted that using L1 in an L2 classroom validates learners’ lived experience, provides the learners with opportunities to experiment and take risks with English, and constitutes a natural bridge for overcoming problems of vocabulary, sentence structure and language confidence. In spite of its significance for classroom management and interaction, L1–L2 classroom CS has been viewed by some as an impediment rather than a resource to learning, and as a mark of linguistic deficiency. Research is needed to educate teachers and language policy makers about the benefit of classroom CS, to change their attitudes toward classroom CS, to raise their awareness about the significance of CS for classroom interaction, and to underscore the importance of L1 in L2 learning.
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