19

Mexican Students' use of Code-switching for diverse classroom situations in the EFL context in a university context

Tatiana Estefanía Galván de la Fuente
Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, México

Introduction

This chapter investigates the code-switching (CS) interactional patterns that students use to participate in the EFL higher education classroom for diverse communication purposes. Several scholars have defined CS in diverse such as the alternation of L1 and L2 in the classroom (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. The limited amount of research focusing on CS in the EFL classroom in the Mexican context, specifically the border with the United States has resulted in a research gap. The majority of the studies in classroom CS literature tend to offer little new insight into how existing classroom CS can be further improved to achieve more, e.g., more understanding of how L1 can be used with a significant positive impact on specific aspects of teaching and learning (e.g., Macaro, 2009; Tian and Macaro, 2012).

In addition, more studies in classroom CS should point more ways for analyzing how these practices can be further improved to gain better pedagogical purposes in the EFL classroom. This article contributes to fill this gap and asks the following research question (hereafter, RQ): What are the code-switching interactional patterns that students use to participate in the EFL higher education classroom?

The research question is explored qualitatively, by analyzing audio-recorded classroom observations and field notes. This descriptive case study draws on an applied Conversation Analysis (ACA) as an analytical framework for classroom data. Three EFL classrooms (Beginners and Intermediate) were observed. The participants are described in detail in the methodology section.

The chapter is divided into four sections. In the first section, a brief overview of research on CS studies that are against monolingual teaching policies that advocate a multilingual practice in the classroom, as well as the conceptual framework, which draws on recent conceptualization of CS. In the second section, the participants, data and methods are specified and presented. The third includes a detailed analysis of classroom data of

Suggested citation:
Galván de la Fuente, T. E. (2021). Mexican Students' use of Code-switching for diverse classroom situations in the EFL context in a university context. In S. Sevilla-Vallejo (Ed.), *Teaching and learning in the 21St Century: Towards a Convergence between Technology and Pedagogy*. (pp. 185-197). Madrid, Spain: Adaya Press.

how these students use diverse linguistic resources, primarily CS for diverse communication purposes in the classroom. The last section entails a discussion of the results, emphasizing the dynamic nature of the use of CS for learning activities, to negotiate meaning, and as a supporting element in the communication of information.

Literature review

The debate over whether to use the first language (L1) in the classroom has been the topic of discussion in many academic circles. Despite the criticisms that have been traditionally disputed against the students´ use of the L1 in the classroom, as it is viewed negatively because the objective is to maximize the use of the target language (Cook, 2001). ESL/EFL teachers argue that such use may lead to more dependence of an ESL/EFL user on his/her own L1 that may impede the progress of acquiring the target language. This controversial issue has resulted in several opposing and supporting arguments (Kavari, 2014). Shin (2005) described attitudes toward CS as being negative, highlighting that bilinguals themselves "may feel embarrassed about their CS and attribute it to careless language habits" (p.18). In another study, Martin (2005), described that CS in Malaysia reveals how the use of the local language as well as the "official" language of the lesson is a recognized event and yet, for diverse reasons, is criticized and deemed as "bad practice", or blamed on the teachers‟ lack of English language competence…."or put to one side and/or swept under the carpet" (p.88). Cancino´s (2015) research seeks to assess the opportunities for learner development and negotiation of meaning that teachers provide in the on-going interaction in an EFL setting. Classroom data also proposes that instances of negotiation of meaning can be cultivated and prompted by the teacher, and their absence can be related to some extent by an inappropriate use of the interactional characteristics that teachers have at their disposition. Amorim's study (2012) analyzes student-student interaction to reveal some of the reasons for code-switching (CS). Classroom interaction data revealed that in order to obtain information conveyed students switched codes, avoiding breakdowns in communication and performing longer turns. CS was used to "fill in lexical or grammatical gaps in the target language, to negotiate language and meaning and to manage the activity and other participants" (Amorim, 2012, p.187). In broad terms, few studies have considered the possibilities to challenge a monolingual micro-order. Thus, that dispute the monolingual bias and continue with multilingual practices that involve phenomena such as code-switching and translanguaging (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011).

Recent scholarship on the discussion of integrating all of the languages in the learner's repertoire have advocated for a more multilingual approach for a pedagogy that fits and is relevant and responsive to developing and evolving needs of the learners (Lethaby, 2006; Mugford, 2009, 2011). For instance, in more take-charge situations, teachers have provided "safe spaces" for the learners to use their multilingual repertoire for learning purposes. Teachers also collaborate with them by using the repertoire(s) as a valuable resource in the classroom, as argued and theorized by (Creese & Blackledge 2010; Garcia, 2009; Hornberger, 2003) on how students may switch between languages and modalities

in their learning. For instance, Lin (2008) highlighted that code-switching in the classroom can have logical and concrete functions since it provides the learner(s) with a means of entry to the curriculum as well as discriminating diverse classroom activities. Similarly, Ferguson (2009) referred to code-switching for "constructing and transmitting knowledge" as well as for "classroom management" (pp.231-232). Both Ferguson (2000) and Lin (2008) recognize that code-switching can also have two functions: an interpersonal function in social interaction as it can be utilized to negotiate identities in the classroom. Similarly, the findings of and Lin and Martin (2005) provide examples of language practices in diverse school contexts in which CS is utilized by both learners and teachers in contexts such as Asia and Africa. These classroom practices reveal both the interpersonal and pedagogical functions of CS.

This research, then, aims to bridge this chasm between a monolingual and multilingual approach to language teaching research through describing these students linguistic practices to negotiate meaning, CS being the linguistic resource that prevails.

Methodology

Participants

I have chosen three classes that represent the ways in which students use CS. There is a 3rd d level (CEFR B1), second level Beginner's (CEFR A2) EFL class, and a 4th level (CEFR B2) classes. The participants from the first excerpt are *Arely, Olimpia, David, Dianna, Salvador, and Samuel*, three female and three male aged between 18 to 32 years of age. The participants in the second excerpt are five: *Tania, Janliek, Roman, Karen, and Diana,* four female and one male, their ages ranging from 18-23 years of age. In the last excerpt, the students are *Cesar, Daniela, Socorro, Merary,* and *Elva.* All the participants are Mexican and for ethical reasons, these are not the participant´s real names. These students were chosen because of their disposition to participate in the on-going interaction of the classroom task assigned and discussed in class that day. These students' samples are representative of the language practices used within the classroom context to communicat. In the analysis, these linguistic practices are demonstrated by focusing particularly on how these students use and position their L1-Spanish-as a linguistic resource.

Research Instruments and procedures

This study attempted to approach the research question using a qualitative paradigm. This descriptive case study aimed to identify the linguistic resources teachers and students draw on in order to accomplish the business of the social interaction in the EFL classroom. Thus, the study used classroom observations and field notes. Two sessions of fifty minutes of non-participant classroom observations were audio-recorded. The aim of these classroom observations were to gain an insider perspective into each one of the participants' language practices in their teaching environment, specifically how they use CS as a linguistic resource for diverse classroom purposes. The field work conducted included comprehensive field notes (i.e., systematic and comprehensive description of all classroom events) that consisted of:

- General information of the class (semester)
- Number of students
- Seating layout
- Activities (as well as interaction types)
- Language used
- Verbal and non-verbal interactions.

Analysis

The data were analyzed in two stages. In the beginning stage, the first audio-recorded observation took place. Field notes were recorded that comprised of such elements as number of students, activities, language used and verbal and non-verbal interactions. The audio-recorded classroom observations were then transcribed. The second and final stage, classroom observations were also transcribed to see if there were any perceived differences or similarities in certain features of conversation, how they were generated and constructed, and how participants constructed their own meanings in the conversational exchange (Seedhouse, 2004). An applied Conversation analysis to classroom observations was used to investigate how these interactions take place between the participants in the language classroom. This approach to the second language classroom is applicable since it is an institutional setting with specific goal-oriented activities, asymmetrical roles, and a context which is continually being constructed for and by the participants through the classroom interaction. Tools from CA aided to demonstrate and explicate the practices that enable members in a conversation to comprehend the interaction and contribute to it (Sacks, 1984). In the data analysis process, the code-switching functions that were identified were *reiteration, equivalence*, and *socializing* which illustrate how they negotiate meaning in the classroom. The analysis demonstrates the diverse linguistic resources these university students use to negotiate meaning in the next section.

Results and Discussion

Excerpt 1: What would you do if?

This first example is from a third level (CEFR B1) EFL classroom. The focus of the class is to discuss a reading exercise related to organ donations using the "What would you do if…?" structure. The learners read the short article in their textbooks and then they are to discuss in their tables what they would do in diverse situations regarding the donation of organs.

1 PAM: So (.) what do you think? Would you donate your organs? It is controversial (.) Some people are against and some are for donating (.) what is your view of this? Get together in groups of four and discuss your answers

2 ARE**:** sometimes (.) maybe but if you don't try to talk the people, ***eeh hablar con ellos para hacerlo*** **to** join us or come with us and help us but a lot of people they doesn't want to… to help you, they don't care if you are going to do it,

3 OLI: yeah (.) *yeah they don't care*…. ***no les importa….para nada***

4 DAV**:** and it's bad,

5 OLI**:** Yeah, and donate my organs, once I considered, actually I was almost to sign but I was afraid, I was like fifty years and I was <*ahh I don't know, I don't want to die"* I think> I was thinking if that I sign this it's like (.) they were going to trap me there but now I want to (.)to sign that so, I can donate my organs and I think it's pretty cool because I'm not going to use them when I'm dead so,

6 DAV: well I think a lot of people they doesn't donate because they don't believe or think it is needed,

7 OLI: yeah (.) because their religion… **religión…es religión *verdad?***

Reiteration

This is the predominant function in this Intermediate classroom. The students use this as a communicative strategy not only for interaction with the teacher, but with the rest of the class as well. It is important to highlight that the reiteration function refers to the CS situation in which L1 is used when the messages have already been expressed in L2, yet they are clarified or emphasized in L1. Pamela"s introduction in (*turn 1*) gears Arely to respond in (t*urn 2)* to the class discussion regarding the donations of organs. Pamela states that it is a controversial topic, so she gives room for the students to give their views on this by "opening up" the "floor". To her open question, Arely self-selects to respond, by indirectly aligning with those who are in favor of donating organs. Her answer that they should try "if you don"t try to "talk to the people" and "es….hablar con ellos….para hacerlo"; her idea first expressed in English, is then reiterated in the L1. Though the message has already been transmitted in one code, the message is reinforced in the native language. This repetition technique allows the participant to give meaning. Arely recurs to CS in order to indicate to Pamela that the content is clearly understood by her. A similar use is reported in Sert´s (2005) study where learners prefer to make their points clear by using a reiteration technique in L1 and has been expressed previously in the L2. In *(turn 1)*, Salvador expresses a concern. He is worried about the fact that some people do, so Arely emphasizes the point by adding that they should be used (organs), - "for a good reason…. por una buena razón…" first in L2, and then in Spanish to reiterate this point. This switch from L1 to L2 indicates the speaker's affection towards a certain individual as well as the statement being highlighted in two languages (Anderson, 2006). This is also evident in my fieldwork, even though Arely is not sitting near Salvador, she wants to evidence that she indeed understand his point and does so by gesturing with her hands in the air to Salvador. She genuinely wants Salvador to see that she understands his concern and she does this by completing his sentence, or by what she interprets what Salvador wants to say by CS to stress this particular statement.

Equivalence

Olimpia, in (turn 7) comments on Davids intervention stating that some people do not donate since they do not believe in doing so, or that they do not believe it is necessary. Olimpia then intercedes and says "yeah because their relation… religion…es religion verdad?" as she uses the equivalence of the lexical item in L2 and then asks Pamela if that is the adequate manner to say "religion". This is a resource used by Olimpia as she code-switches when she is unable to find or is doubtful about the appropriate terminology or identical word (s) from the L2 vocabulary repertoire to match the word(s) of their L1. Therefore, equivalence functions as a type of defensive mechanism or as a stalling device for learners as it provides them the opportunity to continue with communication by aiding the rift resulting from not knowing the lexical item. Students nominated themselves for turns, as the teacher did not directly nominate.

Excerpt 2: What´s in your fridge?

This second example is from a second level Beginner's (CEFR A2) EFL class. This portion of the class begins with the teacher taking up the activity that is left pending before taking the classroom break. It involves reviewing count and non-count nouns as well as a discussion about the procedural content.

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,*

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,

1 11 ROS: what do they have in common? You can say it in "Spanish"

12 JAN: **no se pueden contar…y otro si?** 0 Jan:, what's the difference between, there is/ there are

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.

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

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*". 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.

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.

Excerpt 3: What gets on your nerves?

This third example is from a fourth level (CEFR B2) EFL class. The class observed is oriented towards discussing and reviewing the topic: "Pet Peeves".

15 DAN: no, no (.) you can't believe what happened to me in Manzanilla! everything was burnt and I sent the order back and the chef would not accept ,it was terrible….*y tan caro que esta! ((tr.: and how expensive it is))*

16 SOC: in that restaurant, en ese restaurant! **es puro bluff).*de esos restaurantes verdad*?** The famous chef?

(Socorro looks over at Daniela and laughs as she gestures being a princess and curtsies. The class starts to laugh)

17 LAU: okay,okay,,everyone has had bad experiences in restaurants!

18 CES: *(murmuring)* you have to be diplomatic, not stupid in restaurants….

((Everybody laughs))

19 MER: Okay, something that gets on my nerves, is when (.) when th

20 SOC: when the customer?

21 DAN: yes (.) mocks,when the customer mocks, ***burlarse?*** when the customer mocks to the waiter,

22 JOR: Oh (.)okay,

23 ELV: Maybe (.) the customer, the waiter, beginning, i know, e elva and i am to.. attempt, attention! but the customer, when she mocks, she says: *i am Elva and I,* e customer mocks its waiter,

24 CES: Usually, when I get a, am get nervous, when I, I, when I go to the United States and I go to a restaurant and they try to talk everything in English so I got, they put me very nervous because sometimes I forget the, the name on the.. food (.) so.. that's where I do it, sometimes I get really nervous and I feel they mock me. ***Ayy este!,*** this guy, **no sabe nada, han de pensar!**

25 ELV: for me, what really piss me off at a.restaurant is (.) people talking about disgusting things when you are eating, so that's, Oh sorry teacher!. it makes me mad! ***me enoja!*** for example,

26 LAU: another one?

27 MER: i will tell you what really gets on my nerves, I hate when the clothes are not, are not in their places or in order, is not only confusing me, is also inconsiderate when, when people, ahh! is also inconsiderate, to not put everything back,

28 DAN: what really makes me mad, when there is not an employee to help, maybe I need a size and the employee (.) never attention, or a, or attend me,

29 JOR: I can't, when I go, I can't understand why? when I go to the store, the, the price is high! that is not the case,

30 MER: is not the correct one, not the case to discuss,

31 CES: i know, but things are very expensive now, is not the correct and I have to go to pay and they say <*you need more money to pay this*<, you know?, yeah, so sometimes, I just don't!

(They laugh)

32 LAU: ok, driving, for me Oh my God! , okay, driving with slow drivers!

33 MER: yes, teacher in the fast line!

34 CES: some others, some others drivers drive too slow!

(cesar laughs)

35 ELV: I hate that!

(They laugh, and start simulating the noise of a car, everybody starts joking and laughing)

36 SOC: when some people, their kids are, they are driving and their kids are in the front with them driving,

37 DAN: yeah, they are driving too!

38 SOC: no, they are driving with their kids here in Ensenada in front of the car! ayy no tienen abuela! they have no shame!

Socializing

This socializing CS function occurs in *(turn 15)* as Daniela offers her answer by narrating her experience in a local restaurant named Manzanilla. In this turn, she goes beyond stating her position and provides an account for it in English, but then concludes her sequence with L1: "*y tan caro que esta*!" meaning that the restaurant is very expensive and the service was terrible because the food was burnt and was sent back to the chef who would not accept it.

Daniela used a socializing CS function from the target language to the native language, to express her feeling of displeasure. This is also called "affective functions of CS" Flyman-Mattsson (1999) as students express their emotions as they interact with each other. The socializing use of CS in (turn 16) can be observed. Socorro co-constructs

interaction with Daniela by providing a second part to her story initated in the previous turn. Socorro expands her comment in English and then reiterates it in L1. She negatively assesses the fact that these "types of restaurants" are considered to be "elitist" or "snobbish", *es puro bluff...de esos restaurantes verdad?,* but automatically switches back to L2 to ask for confirmation about the famous chef from Ensenada and the owner of Manzanilla.

In this case, this CS function is performing a social action or develops a sense of group solidarity, often occurring in jokes (Sampson, 2011). This is done so rapport can be established when the group responds to a similar switch that builds solidarity and conveys friendly relations (Sert, 2005). Daniela does this to establish a sort of "solidarity" with those by explaining to her classmates that background to the restaurant and the chef, as she wants her classmates to understand and sympathize along with her, the terrible experience she had. My fieldwork also depicts Socorro looking over at Daniela to gesture as if being a princess and mocks the chef by bowing as if he were some sort of "royal" as also stated in the classroom transcription. These non-verbal acts made the class laugh at what Daniela was trying to get across with her intervention, and she made this very clear with her humor. In *(turn 24),* Cesar clearly exploits this humor in his "wordplay" at the end of the sentence where switches and mixes L1 and L2 in a creative manner, by joking. What is noticeable here is that even though, "*Ayy este*, this guy.. *no sabe nada…han de pensar!"* is at the end of the sentence;it is not fulfilling a floor-holding position. In this turn, Cesar recalls situations in American restaurants or stores where he feels insecure about his linguistic capacity as he perceives the he is mocked by the people there. He voices what he imagines people say and think about him by using direct speech in L1 ("Ayy este, this guy.. no sabe nada…han de pensar!"). His final assessment about the others" assigned behaviors (*deben de pensar*); reinforces this socializing function of CS. It is evident that the CS does not originate from a lexical deficit but from a desire to continue with the on-going interaction without pausing. Liebscher & Dailey-O"Cain (2005, p.239) define it as a "process in native speakers when they perform audible word searches". In Laura´s case, prohibiting L1 in the classroom would most likely be replaced by silence from the learners and would not recur to these CS resources wishing to continue with the unfolding interaction.

The last turn in this excerpt, is Socorro´s intervention that begins in *(turn 36*)and concludes in *(turn 38)*, where she expresses her concern regarding children that are not seated where they are supposed to, and end up in front of the car driving with their parents. Her concern and disagreement with children driving up front with their parent is evidenced by the last comment in her turn "*ayy no tienen abuela*". This is a very common expression in Mexico for stating that (the parents) have "no shame" in doing this. She does this by raising her tone and using L1 to create a sense of emotion as it is triggered by this CS. This expression is used in Mexico to state the fact that some people just have no shame and this is most common expression to convey this feeling without sounding harsh or abrupt since this is the equivalent of a bad word. Scholars such as (Dewaele and Wei, 2014; Pavlenko 2005; and Dewaele, 2010) indicate the relationship between certain languages and emotions in the learners´ linguistic repertoire as they are more multidimensional and complex (Kharkhurin & Wei, 2014). Therefore, some emotions may provoke more CS in some, while in others it may inhibit some orientation to a particular language.

Table 1. Transcription Conventions (Seedhouse, 2004, p. 267)

3.2	Interval between utterances in seconds
(.)	Very short untimed pause
word	Speaker emphasis
E:r the:::	Lengthening of the preceding sound
-	Abrupt cutoff
?	Rising intonation, not necessarily a question
!	Animated or emphatic tone
	Additional symbols
Ja ((tr.:yes))	Non-English words are italicized and are followed by an English translation in double parentheses
T:	Teacher
L:	Unidentified learner
Li:	Identified learner
LL:	Several or all learners simultaneously
[	Point of overlap onset
]	Point of overlap termination
< >	Talk surrounded by angle is produced slowly and deliberately(typical of teachers modeling forms)
><	Talk surrounded by reversed angle brackets is produce more quickly than neighboring talk
( )	A stretch of unclear or unintelligible

Discussion and Conclusion

The descriptive case study presented reveal that these 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 manage the interaction, comment on the task as well guide and contribute to classmates‟ interventions.

This research taps into the need for a greater sensitivity to the use of linguistic resources in the EFL classroom. Teachers need to be more aware of the linguistic resources at their disposal as a new generation of teachers should embrace a more pragmatic approach to the use of the L1 in the EFL classroom. An exploration of theories and methodologies that consider teaching within a "prescribed" method and a call for a more "local" approach to language teaching and learning should be endorsed. Globalized EFL/

ESL teaching methodologies which advocate for a "one-size fits all" pedagogy should not be applicable and practiced in classrooms around the world. 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 among educators and school authorities to legitimatize the status of the L1 in the EFL classroom. Ideally, these conversations should lead to discussions on what teachers actually do in their classroom practice, hence classroom practice has not generated theory. In other words "there has been one-way traffic between theory and practice" (Seedhouse, 2004, p.265). So in other words, the goal is that through the analysis of classroom data, pedagogical theory will be generated inductively and enable that two-way street between both theory and actual practice.

Classroom observations and classroom transcriptions using and applied CA approach demonstrate that CS is a strategy that these Mexican learners resort to "intentionally and or unconsciously, to achieve their communicative objectives" (Amorim, 2012, p.178). The analysis demonstrates how students resort to 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, 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. 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.

As a field, we need to think in broader terms in order to achieve new insights into classroom code-switching. The integration of a sociolinguistic interpretive and conversation-analytic perspectives, as this study adopts, so that EFL teachers understand and become aware of bilingual or multilingual classroom strategies. 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 is needed (Garcia, 2009, 2011, 2013; Garcia & Wei, 2014; Pennycook, 2007). Thus, asking new questions will require a profound reevaluation of not just theoretical concepts, but our teaching practice as well. Now is the time for such work.

References

Amorim, R. (2012). Code switching in student-student interaction; functions and reasons!. *Linguística: Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Universidade do Porto*, *7*.

Anderson, T. K. (2006). The role of Codeswitching as a Communicative Tool in an ESL Teacher Education Class. *Procedia, Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *90,* 458-467.

Ariffin, K., Susanti Husin, M. (2011). Code-switching and Code-mixing of English and Bahasa Malaysia in Content-Based Classrooms: Frequency and Attitudes. *Linguistics Journal*, *5*(1).

Azlan I., Narasuman, S. (2013). The role of code-switching as a communicative tool in an ESL teacher education classroom. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *90*, 458-467.

Cancino M. (2015). Assessing Learning Opportunities in EFL Classroom Interaction: What Can Conversation Analysis Tell Us?. *RELC Journal*, *46*(2), 115-129.

Cenoz, J., Gorter, D. (2011). A holistic approach to multilingual education: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 339-343.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education.* Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group. London and New York.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian modern language review*, *57*(3), 402-423.

Creese, A., Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A pedagogy for learning and Teaching? *Modern Language Journal, 94,* 103-115.

Dewaele, J. (2010). *Emotions in multiple languages*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Dewaele, J. M., Wei, L. (2014). Attitudes towards code-switching among adult mono-and multilingual language users. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *35*(3), 235-251.

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

Ferguson, G. (2009). What next? Towards an agenda for classroom codeswitching research. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*, 231-241.

Flyman-Mattsson, A. (1999). Students" communicative behavior in a foreign language classroom. *Working papers,* 47, 39-57. Lund University, Department of Linguistics.

Gauci, H., Camilleri Grima, A. (2012). Codeswitching as a. tool in teaching Italian in Malta, *International Journal of Bilingual education and bilingualism*.

Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century. A global perspective*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heller, M., Martin-Jones, M. (2001)(Eds.). *Voices of authority. Education and linguistic difference*, Westport: Ablex.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Points of view and blind spots: ELF and SLA. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *16*(2), 137-162.

Kavari, K. E. (2014). Discourse Analysis and its Contributions to English Language Teaching. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, *4*(3), 276-281.

Lethaby, C. (2006). Appropriating English in Mexico, *Mextesol Journal*, *30*(2), 51-58.

Liebscher, G., Dailey O"Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the Content Based Foreign Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(2), 234-247.

Lin, A.M.Y., Martin, P. (2005)(Eds). *Decolonisation, globalization: Language-in-education policy and practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lin, A. (2008). Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. In K.A. King & N.H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language Education, 2nd ed., vol. 10: Research methods in language and education* (pp. 273-286). New York: Springer.

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.

Martin, P. (2005). Safe language practices in two rural schools in Malaysia: Tensions between policy and practice. *Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in-Education Policy and Practice (75-99.) Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters*.

Mugford Fowler, G., (2009). *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.

Mugford, G. (2011). Locally situated Foreign -language teaching: Promoting English language learning that reflects Mexican realities. *Memorias de las Jornadas de Lenguas en Contacto.*

Pavlenko, A. (2005). Bilingualism and thought. *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic approaches*, *433453*.

Sacks, H. (1984) On doing “being ordinary”. In J. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 413-29.

Sampson, A. (2011). Learner code-switching versus English only.*ELT Journal,* 66, 293-302.

Sert, O. (2005). The Functions of Code-Switching in ELT Classrooms. *Online Submission*, *11*(8).

Shin, H., Crookes, G. (2005). Exploring the possibilities for EFL critical pedagogy in Korea: A two-part case study. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal*, *2*(2), 113-136.

Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The internet TESL journal*, *3*(10), 1-6.

Unamuno, V. (2008). Multilingual switch in peer classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education, 19,* 1-19.

Wei, L. (2005). How can you tell? Towards a common sense interpretation of conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics, 37,* 375-89.

ISBN 978-84-09-29613-2