

**\*\*\*La naturaleza de apoyo de las funciones de Classroom Codeswitching en un centro de idiomas de educación superior de inglés como lengua extranjera en México: ¿Sigue siendo inadecuadamente mal entendido el Codeswitching? \*\*\***

**The supportive nature of Classroom Codeswitching functions in a Mexican EFL higher education language center: Does Codeswitching remain inadequately misunderstood?**

*Tatiana E. Galván De la Fuente<sup>a</sup>, Jesús E. Fong Flores<sup>b</sup>*

---

**Abstract:**

Classroom codeswitching continues to be a debatable topic in current education practice as some teachers believe that the alternate codes of two languages in the classroom can be conflictive as others view it as positive. Currently, in multilingual societies of the 21st century, codeswitching (CS) is an everyday occurrence where both teachers and learners' resort to their L1 in order to achieve a specific communicative purpose. From an interactional point of view, this case study deriving from the PhD work "*Contesting Monolingual Policies in the Multilingual classroom: a case study of a language center at a Mexican state university on the border with the U.S.*", examines how EFL university students are using CS functions for diverse classroom purposes such as *equivalence*, *reiteration*, and *socializing* in a predominantly "only in English" context. Specifically, observation sessions were carried out as these depictions demonstrated what was taking place in the classroom. Field notes are used to triangulate data; therefore, a more in-depth and solid analysis is brought forth as to how these resources are used. Consequently, classroom data was analyzed using an applied CA approach as it yields an explanation of the practices at hand that enable the participants of a conversation to negotiate meaning. Findings support Macaro's (2014) argument that for CS discourse to be authenticated, it has to be accepted by both parties (teachers and students) in the classroom context. Meaning that CS is utilized for the purpose of learning as well as communication if and only if the participants in the discourse agree that the interaction involving CS is appropriate for the purpose it was intended. This classroom data evidences whether the L1 should be present is a matter, which needs reasoned discussion among policy makers and specifically educators to fully understand the supportive nature of CS in the language classroom.

**Keywords:**

*Code-switching, only in English, code-switching functions, Conversation Analysis Approach, English as a foreign language*

---

**Resumen:**

La alternancia de códigos en el aula continúa siendo un tema de debate en la práctica educativa actual, ya que algunos profesores consideran que el uso de dos idiomas en el aula puede generar conflictos, mientras que otros lo ven de manera positiva. En las sociedades multilingües del siglo XXI, la alternancia de códigos es una práctica cotidiana donde profesores y alumnos recurren a su L1 con el fin de lograr un propósito comunicativo en una lengua extranjera. Este estudio de caso derivado del trabajo de doctorado titulado "Cuestionando las políticas monolingües en el aula multilingüe: un estudio de caso de un centro de idiomas en una universidad estatal mexicana en la frontera con Estados Unidos", examina cómo los estudiantes universitarios de inglés como lengua extranjera utilizan las funciones de cambio de códigos para diversos propósitos en el aula, como son la equivalencia, la reiteración y la socialización, visto así en un contexto predominantemente "solo en inglés". Específicamente, se realizaron observaciones para demostrar lo que estaba ocurriendo en el aula. Las notas de campo se utilizan para triangular los datos; por lo tanto, se presenta un análisis más profundo y sólido sobre cómo se utilizan dichos recursos. En consecuencia, los datos fueron analizados utilizando un enfoque de AC aplicado, ya que proporciona una explicación de las prácticas en cuestión que permiten a los participantes de una conversación negociar el significado. Los hallazgos respaldan el argumento de Macaro (2014) quien establece que la autenticidad del cambio de códigos debe ser aceptado por ambas partes (profesores y estudiantes) en el contexto del aula. Esto significa que la alternancia de códigos se utiliza con un propósito de aprendizaje y comunicación solo si los participantes están de acuerdo en que la interacción discursiva, que incluye la alternancia de códigos, es apropiada para el propósito previsto. Los datos de esta investigación

---

a Tatiana E. Galván De la Fuente, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California | Ensenada-Baja California | México, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7557-782X>, Email: [tatiana@uabc.edu.mx](mailto:tatiana@uabc.edu.mx)

b Jesús E. Fong Flores, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California | Ensenada-Baja California | México, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2830-4834>, Email: [fong.eduardo@uabc.edu.mx](mailto:fong.eduardo@uabc.edu.mx)

Fecha de recepción: 13/07/2024, Fecha de aceptación: 18/09/2024, Fecha de publicación: 05/11/2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29057/lc.v6i11.13444>



evidencian que la presencia de la L1 es un asunto que requiere una discusión fundamentada entre los responsables de las políticas educativas y, específicamente, los educadores, para comprender la naturaleza de la alternancia de códigos en el aula de lenguas.

**Palabras Clave:**

*Alternancia de código, solo en inglés, funciones de alternancia de código, enfoque de análisis conversacional, inglés como lengua extranjera*

## Introduction

The notion that the “only in English” norm is the most adequate medium of instruction policy an english as a foreign language context (EFL) has prompted both educators and policy makers in Mexico, to stress the importance of the only in English teaching methods in the language classrooms. In consequence, the occurrence of Codeswitching (CS), the combined use of the mother-tongue and the target language is perceived in a derogatory light. As both scholars and teacher trainers, becoming aware of this reality, we were therefore obligated to question the components that are taught and discussed in teacher-training programs that had failed to recognize the use of the first language in the second language classrooms as opposed to implementing a more holistic approach to language teaching and learning where the languages in the learners’ repertoire are taken into account. As researchers, we viewed this as an opportunity to gain insight and an understanding of this situation by systematically studying the elements through an interpretive approach as it is fundamental in understanding in the classroom context. (Buchel, 1992; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Maxwell, 2012).

In the case of Mexico, the monolingual tenet maintains that “English is best taught monolingually and this involves the rejection of the experience of other languages along with attempts to impose a single lens on the world” ([Phillipson, 1992:189). This view of always utilizing English in the classroom is especially prevalent in both private and public sector EFL teaching in Mexico even though there is no evidence that English is best taught monolingually (Mugford, & Higareda, 2009). This maximum exposure tenet affirms that “the more English is taught, the better the results” (1992:199). Therefore, if other languages are used, there is a preconceived idea that the standards of English will drop. This idea has long been held accounted for in many educational institutions, as well as with teachers who try to minimize the use of Spanish in the classroom or in the syllabus as a whole.

This idea can be demonstrated specifically through the classroom observations of this project which appear to be determining attitudes towards the teaching of EFL in this language center as they “struggle” with an invisible, but tangible “English only policy”. The personal and contextual aspects previously mentioned, are for the most part overlooked “in one-size fits all” pedagogy in second language methodologies in Mexico. Both policy makers

and school authorities should respond to both the global context and the local EFL environment by examining English language use in terms of bilingual, bicultural, and multilingual language uses rather than trying to replicate inner-circle teaching methods (Holliday, 1994: 2005). This brings to the floor many contextual issues such as an understanding of when and where CS can be implemented in the classroom by both teachers and students to negotiate meaning, and the importance of this in bilingual education.

### The context where this classroom code-switching takes place

The United States border is approximately 105 kilometers and this close proximity leads to an influx and constant interaction in English for diverse purposes such as social, commercial, and academic. The Language Center (CEC) is located within the Faculty of Languages at the University of Baja California in Ensenada, Mexico. Given the close proximity of Mexico to the U.S. border, certain particularities of language use and concepts such as transnationalism, transborder, and codeswitching creates a set of challenges for EFL teachers as language is no longer limited to geographical borders “(Mugford, 2011:81).

### Theoretical framework

Bilingual education has often and traditionally argued that languages should be kept separate in the learning and teaching of languages. It is often hinted that teachers should compartmentalize and teach languages as autonomous and discrete linguistic entities as this benefits the learner.

The alternation of L1 and L2 in the classroom is generally known as code-switching (Martin-Jones, 1997; Milroy and Muysken, 1995; Auer, 1984, 1988a). While this is an umbrella term used in a range of ways, it does speak of a certain position on language, therefore we adhere to the definition that code-switching since it takes into account the abilities that multilingual speakers have to switch within or between sentences from and to the codes in their repertoire (Corcoll-Lopez & Gonzalez-Davies, 2015).

The use of classroom CS is that the purpose of interaction between the actors in the conversation or discourse is both to communicate with each other and (for one set of speakers at least) to learn or develop or in some way enhance their L2.

Eldridge (1996) sets forth six CS functions that are used in this study: equivalence, meta-language, floor-holding,

reiteration, socializing, and L2 avoidance. Equivalence code-switches are those that appear to be provoked by the absence of the lexical item in the learners' inter-language. Meta-language happens because even though the learners perform the task(s) in English, the discussion about and them and other concerns regarding procedure are carried out in their L1. Floor holding occurs when it is used by learners who want to continue with the on-going interaction without pausing or being interrupted, so the switch from L2 to L1 takes place because the item can be recovered faster in L1. Reiteration: This CS function happens when the messages have already been articulated in the target language, but are clarified or highlighted in L1, especially when they are perceived to not have been understood by either party. Socializing: These switches seem to develop a sense of group solidarity, generally occurring in jokes or gossip. L2 avoidance: This takes place when a learner seems to have the linguistic resource(s) to communicate the message in L2, but prefers to do so in L1.

The theoretical foundation presented above, sheds light on the purposes that both the teacher and these university students had for resorting to their L1 in the classroom. Considering that CS is used for communicative purposes, these assumptions aided in identifying which were the most relevant functions.

### Methodology

This research is qualitative in nature and relies on a descriptive case study. This was chosen as the research paradigm since the researchers described and interpreted what occurred between both teacher and students as they aim to communicate with an array of linguistic resources at their disposal. The data thus yielded will include the meanings and purposes of those people who are their source" (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011.p.18). Further, the theory generated must make sense to those to whom it applies, thus theory becomes sets of meaning which yield insight and understanding of people's actions. This particular perspective granted me the opportunity to grasp and understand the language practices that both teacher and learner engage in in order to communicate in the EFL classroom.

### Participants

This excerpt is from a second level Beginner's (CEFR A2) EFL class. There are five student participants in this extract, see Table 1 for their profiles. Their ages range from 18- 23 years. All of the student participants were students of different fields within the university, the field of language teaching and translation studies, as well as the public that enrolls to learn English at the language centre.

Table 1. Participants.

| Participants                  | Discipline              |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1.Tania<br>2.Roman<br>3.Karen | Psychology              |
| 4.Janliek<br>5.Diana          | Business Administration |

### Data collection strategies

Naturalistic observations were appropriate for this study. In a naturalistic type of observation, the intention is "to observe participants in their natural settings, their everyday social settings and their behavior in them" (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011, p. 465). In other words, the context provides a deeper understanding and knowledge, since it may enable the researcher to see things that participants themselves are not aware of, or that they are unwilling to discuss (Patton, 1990). Strictly speaking, the context speaks for itself by providing a holistic view, where even the most unnoticed issues, interactions or intentions may contain both some behavioral or complex assumptions (e.g., insider knowledge). Adhering to the type of classroom observation, the role as researcher through a non-participant observer stance was unobtrusive, remaining open to the language practices used to communicate between teacher and student(s) that we wanted to observe. The observing criteria was not a systematic or rigid instrument, since a systematic type observation does not consider specific characteristics of the particular context or its participants, as this specific context and its unique features that we were interested in observing and not on "fitting" teachers into pre-determined categories or slots.

The second half of class time was observed, resulting in approximately 47min. of audio-recordings and field notes. The second half of the class begins with the teacher taking up the activity that was left pending before taking the classroom break. It involves reviewing count and non-count nouns as well as a discussion about the procedural content. There are diverse interactional sequences in this classroom data. Interactions consisted of answering, discussing, and assessing contributions about the task. The field notes and interactional data demonstrate that students are recurring to CS as a resource for communicative and academic purposes. This is analyzed in this next section.

Field notes were also used to provide a systematic and comprehensive description of all the classroom events such as:

- General information of the class (semester)

- Number of students
- Seating layout
- Activities (as well as interaction types)
- Language used
- Verbal and non-verbal interactions

### Data analysis

An Applied Conversational Analysis approach was used to describe and give an account of the ways of the ways that both teacher and learner(s) construct and manage the interaction. This approach can be applied to the second language classroom along with other qualitative methods such as classroom observations as this aids in understanding the complex nature of the second language context. An applied CA approach to the second language classroom is applicable since it is an institutional setting with specific goal-oriented activities, asymmetrical roles, and a context that is continually being constructed for and by the participants through the classroom interaction, see Appendix 1 for the transcription conventions.

### Discussion of findings

#### Extract: What's in your fridge?

1 ROS: how do you express this? what do you have in your fridge?

2 TAN: what's in my fridge? **que hay en mi refri?**

[Tania thinks hard and sighs about what is in there as this causes the class to laugh at that she may never open her refrigerator because she either never cooks or does not know how]

3 ROS: what is in your fridge?

4 ROM: I have beer, **cerveza**.

5 ROS: is there another alternative?

6 L2: there are/ there is, **hay mas cerveza que comida**, *there is more beer than food*,

[These two unidentified students are laughing at Roman, joking with him that he has no food in his refrigerator except beer and Roman just laughs at their comment]

7 ROS: good, very good! (.) so you say, there is only beer!

8 CON: there are waffles, there is sausage, repeat, sausage, (whole-class)

9 ROS: there is/there are tortillas,

10 Jan: what's the difference between, there is/there are?

11 ROS: what do they have in common? You can say it in "Spanish"

12 JAN: **no se pueden contar...y otro si?**

13 ROS: what do you need so you can count them... some sort of meaning device... orange juice comes in... a glass, bottle. What about bacon?... a string of bean, a piece, a package of?

14 KAR: teacher "**rebanada**" a slice... if these are countable?

15 ROS: yes, countable, what's the name of these words? **Como se llaman estas palabras?**

16 DIA: **Estas palabras se llaman** countable-non-countable.. they are called countable-non-countable

17 ROS: summarizing... nouns are divided into two categories... come one Diana, you know this... so now you countable-non countable. Do you have any questions? I should fine you...for using Spanish!!

18 LL: **tenemos una duda teacher**.one question...

[three unidentified learners ask Rosario a question, but she does not address their question and jumps into reviewing the task at hand, leaving the learners with a puzzled look]

19 ROS: so now you are going to tell your team what you have in your fridge, I expect you to use "there is/there are". Work in pairs, you have 15 min. to do the task. Please work with someone you have not worked with this week. [the students are organizing the pair work deciding who is going to work with who, there is a lot of noise since they are moving around]

20 JAN: pairs teacher? I am thinking...to work with who? **de eso se trata...** to think right?

[the pair next to Janliek (a boy and a girl) starts to laugh and then one of them states that he has not worked with her this week, and that they should work together causing the other partner to scan around the room to see if another classmate is available. Once she spots another classmate, she gets up and leaves, leaving Janliek without a partner and eventually joining another group across the room]

21 ROS: good! that is what this exercise is about,

22 ROM: I am thinking that I have fruit, vegetables, milk,

23 ROS: very good... go ahead... ask her...your partner.

[Roman turn to his partner who is setting in front of him, she turns around and they begin to interact]

24: ROM: what do you have in your fridge?  
[rosario starts to walk around once she sees that Roman is working with his partner and goes by every group to check on them]

25 ROS: excuse me, come on people! no you are going to write 5 questions/answers in your student book,

26 TAN: I already did them,

27 ROS: ok then! you have 2 sec if everybody already did them!

[Rosario jokes about Tania's comment and everybody looks over at her as if she should not have made that comment since Rosario now wants everybody to finish the exercise in 2 seconds]

28 KAR: [she begins to gesture and raises her hand that she has a question]. a question how do you say **primo/prima**...cousins?

29 ROS: yes, **primo/prima**! now, how many uncles/aunts do you have?

30 KAR: like seven,

31 ROS: Wow!

32: KAR: yes!

33 ROS: and your mother? how many aunts? Uncles? anybody?

34 DIA: aunts-five, uncles-four

35 ROS: ok, that's a small family,

36 ROS: ROM, are you ready?, you are still writing?

37 ROM: yes,i am ready,

38 ROS: yes, ok (.), now let's everybody try to finish so we can move on to the next task before our break

### Equivalence

This extract begins with Rosario's opening sequence where she is setting up the task by asking students how they express "this" and what they have in their refrigerator. Tania self-selects in (*turn 2*) to ask out loud to herself what she has in her refrigerator in L2, and then switches to give the equivalence in L1. My observations show that she frowns and thinks about what is in her fridge. She sighs and then answers in L1 making visible that she thought long and hard about what is in her refrigerator. This action makes visible the fact that Tania is not aligning with the task at hand and instead, she is speaking about her own reality. This causes the class to laugh. Evidently, she never offers the preferred answer. The use of jokes and humor is evident in this classroom extract in the 50 min. period. *Turn 4* is taken by Roman as he provides an answer to Rosario as the interaction unfolds. He quickly jumps to seize the turn as his tone of voice rises as he gives his contribution in L2 and then reiterates in Spanish. It is worth highlighting that this is also done in all three excerpts as the students first provide their answer in English and then CS to L1. The next equivalence turn is evidenced in (*turn 14*) where Karen addresses Rosario to ask in English first, then switch into Spanish to emphasize and confirm if the appropriate lexical item is evidently "a slice" and if it is countable or not. This form of participation allows to interpret that the vocabulary word is available to Karen in the second language, but then she switches to L1 to check if she is correct.

In (*turn 18*), three unidentified learners ask Rosario a question and their language choice is first Spanish and then they reiterate it in L2. "*tenemos una duda teacher,one question*". The switch may be due to Rosario checking, summarizing and emphasizing Diana's contribution in L2 that the information is known to her and

others. She also reprimands Diana by stating that she should be fined for using Spanish and that she knows the grammatical content.

The previous turn prompts the learners to switch to L1 to make it easier to highlight to the teacher and the students that they understood what they were requested to do. This action evidences that the learners want to make sure that they understand what was going on which is not addressed by Rosario. *Turn 20* continues with Janliek's answer regarding who to work with "de eso se trata...to think right?", in Rosario's intervention in two previous turns. Janliek mid-sentence reiterates in Spanish that she does not know who to work with and that the objective is to think. Fieldwork illustrates that Janliek is wondering who to work with and ends up without a group to work with. In (*turn 28*), Karen makes a question where Rosario acknowledges the answer as correct in both L1 and L2 and is ready to move onto the next answer. The exchange in (*turn 29*) takes place in the last minutes of class time where Karen signals to Rosario and gives an equivalence of cousins "yes, primo/prima", in regards to the question. The teacher uses L2 indicating that he wants to move along with the lesson and does it in English, thus rendering the interaction rather formal, meaning she means business.

### Reiteration

Rosario's L1 and L2 choice in this turn to Karen in (*turn 15*) are done to clarify and emphasize a grammatical rule acknowledging that the learner has a question (Gauci & Camilleri Grima, 2012) and not putting Karen on the spot with her question in L1. Presumably, this makes the assimilation of content more efficient "as the learners can use their L1 as an anchoring point" (Gauci & Camilleri Grima, 2012, p. 620). In the next turn, (*turn 16*), Diana addresses Rosario's question by using L1. This CS to reiterate is a language switch related to the flow of the teacher-learner interaction (Chaudron, 1988, p.50) as the majority of teacher speech acts are "soliciting and reacting moves". Diana's turn is an example of this as recurring to this action does not stop or abrupt the on-going interaction. The use of L1 is faster than retrieval in the target code.

These three excerpts provide a first-hand sense of what takes place in these EFL classrooms. The findings demonstrate that even though they are different levels and type of learners, they resort to CS that aids them in communication purposes. This study does not permit to generalize whether CS should be banned or introduced as a linguistic resource in the EFL classroom. Teachers should have a better understanding of this linguistic phenomenon as a "heightened awareness" (Sert, 2005) of its use in the language classroom discourse. This understanding will hopefully lead to better teacher

instruction and practice in considering or eliminating it in the classroom.

### Conclusions

The analysis of the classroom data establishes that EFL students use code-switching for diverse communication, academic, and pedagogical purposes in the classroom. There were diverse code-switching functions in the classroom, but the most prevalent were three: *socializing, reiteration, and equivalence*. All three functions were used by learners in these three classrooms for contrastive analysis, floor-holding or establishing links with their peers and teacher associated with communication and learning objectives. Classroom interactional data demonstrates that CS is used for continuity of the on-going interaction instead of presenting interference in language use. In this respect, CS stands to be a supporting feature in EFL classroom communication of content and in social interaction; therefore it "serves for communicative purposes in the student's code-switching" (Sert, 2005). There may be a tendency for beginners to use L1 to prompt and clarify meaning or a translation function. Advanced learners (Intermediate and High Intermediate) students tend to use it to manage the interaction, to comment on the task as well as to guide and contribute to classmates' interventions. What is noticeable of the three excerpts of classroom data is that students alternated between the two codes to socialize and manage the turn-taking, and it did not matter if they were initial or advanced students. They both used these CS functions to work towards communication. Cook (2008, p. 179) highlights, when bilingual speakers are 'aware that they share two or more languages, there is a high probability that CS will occur as the classroom itself becomes a code-switching situation because it is not a monolingual environment'. The use of CS seems to be effective for student learning and it is "encouraged to be used when teaching students with a low proficiency level, though it must not be allowed to overtake the target language in the classroom" (Azlan, 2013, p. 467). Accordingly, the use of CS by both students and teachers should follow a certain pedagogical strategy for it to be considered an effective tool within the EFL classroom.

The teacher participants in these three classes evidenced their perceptions of CS through their classroom practice. They used CS for different purposes regardless of the level and they oriented themselves to a particular language to address certain aspects of the tasks at hand. Only *Rosario* seemed to address the use of L2 when she stated that there should be a fine for a student using L1 in the classroom interaction. According to Macaro (2005, p. 68), the majority of 'teachers regard CS as unfortunate and regrettable but necessary'. What is also noticeable is that there is a certain variable made visible by the

teachers when deciding to recur to CS to negotiate meaning. This variable is learner language proficiency as their choice in language for instruction is based upon this. L1 is used as a teaching device along with the use of non-verbals, gestures, and telling jokes as they were used by learners to communicate as well.

Both fieldwork and classroom observations demonstrate that CS is a strategy that learner's resort to "intentionally and or unconsciously, to achieve their communicative objectives" (Amorim, 2012, p.178). CS in these three classes permitted effective communication between the participants and the teacher in a way that was natural and comfortable for all involved. Whether it is to address a certain grammatical rule, to set up the task, highlight a certain piece of information, or a repetition of a certain part of the discourse, CS is used as a valuable linguistic resource. This concurs with Sert's (2005, p.1) belief that in "ELT classrooms, code-switching comes into use either in the teachers' or the students' discourse". Accordingly, the findings of this study described how EFL teachers adopt a more suitable conversational strategy in the classroom to create an atmosphere for students to engage in classroom interactions (Moghadam & Davoudi, 2016; Amorim, 2015; Anderson, Kagwesage & Rusanganwa, 2012, Gauci & Camilleri Grima, 2013, Creese and Blackledge 2010, Garcia and Wei, 2014).

#### **Suggestions:**

There are a few suggestions that we would like to set forth:

##### **Appropriate teacher-training courses:**

Given its close proximity to the U.S. border, English-language use and culture is unified into everyday communication and classroom interaction. Consequently, the language use creates a set of objections for ELT teachers as language is no longer constrained to geographical borders. This type of language use is marked by CS as a communicative resource which involves creativity on behalf of the learners and teachers alike.

This study directly impacts the field of language education amongst others, as a need to look beyond further and explore what other pedagogic resources are accessible in adjustable, contemporary approaches and methods to teaching and learning languages multilingually (Lin and Martin, 2005). Therefore, highlight the vital importance of incorporating languages that are part of the learners' linguistic repertoires at both the academic and social levels to legitimize the status of their L1 in the classroom. The data obtained from this research calls for an urgent need for both teachers and university authorities to reconsider a multilingual pedagogy "fit" or "catered" to meet their students' specific needs. This would permit the learners to maximize their learning as they are able to

draw on their language skills (in two or more languages), rather than "being restricted and discouraged to do so by monolingual instructional assumptions and practices" (Hornberger, 2005, p.607).

##### **An informed teaching practice:**

It is evident in both classroom observations and field notes that the teachers' approach to second language teaching is somewhat flexible as they adopt a more strategic approach to the use of CS in the classroom. An informed teaching practice regarding the mobility and plasticity of these CS resources in which both teachers and students deploy them is demonstrated. Even though some teachers feel somewhat restricted in this "tight" English only discourse, the need to move away from a "target language only policy" to a "target language mainly" is needed in order to foster informed practices on the use of CS in their classes. Although the exposure to the target language should predominate in the EFL classroom, these teachers clearly steer away from a paradoxical perspective of teaching these multilingual students through monolingual instruction, towards incorporating the advantages teaching multilingual learners within a multilingual approach.

Pushing this argument further, scholars such as (Garcia, 2009, 2011, 2013; Garcia & Wei, 2014; Pennycook, 2007), advocate a more international perspective for universities where learners are able to draw on their multilingual resources to engage in and achieve diverse conversational goals in communication with their peers and teacher. There is a need to take into consideration a view that considers how EFL learners creatively "co-construct" English for their own purposes by treating the language as a shared communicative resource where they have the freedom to accommodate to each other, code-switch, and create innovative forms that differ from the norms of native English and do not require sanctioning by native English speakers, Jenkins, 2006, p.10). If teachers are to go beyond the misuse of multilingual resources as well as ease the guilt associated with CS in educational contexts, further research is needed on classroom language ecologies "to show how and why pedagogic bilingual or multilingual practices come to be legitimated and accepted by participants" (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 113).

Such a dialogue could be pushed forth by both teachers and students alike as among educators and school authorities to legitimize the status of the L1 in the EFL classroom. Hornberger and Link (2012, p.268) argue that multilingual practices "offer possibilities for teachers and learners to access academic content through the linguistic resources and communicative repertoires they bring to the classroom while simultaneously acquiring "new ones".

The argument is that second language studies should consider new perspectives which allow the integration and understanding of the reciprocal approach of foreign language classroom interaction (e.g. the natural and the pedagogic). Successively, this will enable to describe the kind of talk that both teaching and learning through the language and about the language is used for. Therefore, by incorporating languages that form part of the learners' linguistic repertoires in order to emphasize that they are considered a vital resource in the higher education context and within society itself.

International Journal of Education Management. Vol. 19, pp. 127-140.

- [15] Mugford, G. (2011). Locally situated Foreign -language teaching: Promoting English language learning that reflects Mexican realities. *Memorias de las Jornadas de Lenguas en Contacto*. ISBN 978-607-7868-38-5
- [16] Mugford, G. (2015). *Duermes mucho Tony?: Usos interpersonales y transaccionales de la lengua materna en el aula de clase de lengua extranjera*. 1st ed. Guadalajara, México: Universidad de Guadalajara, México. ISSN 1657-0790.
- [17] Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## Referencias

- [1] Amorim, R. (2012). Code switching in student-student interaction; functions and reasons!. *Linguística: Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Universidade do Porto*, 7.
- [2] Andersson, I., Kagwesage, A. M. and Rusanganwa, J. (2012). Negotiating meaning in multilingual goupwork: a case study of higher education in Rwanda. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-15.
- [3] Auer, P., ed. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- [4] N. M. N. I. Azlan dan S. Narasuman, "The Role of Code Switching as a Communicative Tool inan ESL Teacher Education Classroom,"*Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2013. (13) (PDF) Code Switching in Speaking Classroom Conversation: A Focus on Lecturer-Student Interaction at University of Muhammadiyah Malang. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360579734\\_Code\\_Switching\\_in\\_Speaking\\_Classroom\\_Conversation\\_A\\_Focus\\_on\\_Lecturer-Student\\_Interaction\\_at\\_University\\_of\\_Muhammadiyah\\_Malang](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360579734_Code_Switching_in_Speaking_Classroom_Conversation_A_Focus_on_Lecturer-Student_Interaction_at_University_of_Muhammadiyah_Malang) [accessed Jul 07 2024].
- [5] Chaudron, G. (1988). *Second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Cohen, Louis. Manion, Lawrence, and Morrison, Keith. (2011). *Research Methods in Education*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group, London and New York.
- [7] Corcoll López, C., & González-Davies, M. (2015). Switching codes in the plurilingual classroom. *Elt Journal*, 70(1), 67-77.
- [8] Creese A. & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A pedagogy for learning and Teaching? *.Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 94 . P. 103-115.
- [9] Creese , A. & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and Identity in Educational settings. *Annual review of Applied Linguistics* 35 (2015), pp. 20-35.
- [10] Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT journal*, 50(4), 303-311.
- [11] Gauci, H. & Camilleri Grima, A. (2012). Codeswitching as a tool in teaching Italian in Malta, *International Journal of Bilingual education and bilingualism*.
- [12] Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In *Non-native language teachers*, ed. E.Llurda, 63-84, New York: Springer.
- [13] Martin, P. (1999a). Bilingual unpacking of monolingual texts in two primary schools in Brunei Darussalam. *Language and Education* Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 35-38.
- [14] Martin, P. (1999b). Close encounters of a bilingual kind: International practices in the primary classroom in Brunei.