English-Tagalog Code-Switching in English Language Teaching

Ariane Macalinga Borlongan
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
arianemacalingaborlongan@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study investigates English-Tagalog code-switching in English language classes in Metro Manila, the Philippines. A corpus containing a total of 14 English language classes was analyzed to determine how frequent teachers and students code-switch in those classes and bring to light the forms and functions of the code-switches of both the teachers and students. The analysis of the data reveals that most English language teachers in the sample code-switch; students likewise code-switch in their English language classes. Instances of English-Tagalog code-switching in the corpus are mostly smooth switches. Following a preliminary analysis using Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson's typology (1999) on the functions of teacher code-switches and Eldridge's (1996) on student code-switches, a new typology is proposed to better capture the psycho-sociolinguistic reality of English-Tagalog code-switching in English language classes in Metro Manila, the Philippines. The new typology proposed is a unified one; it does not distinguish code-switches made by teachers and code-switches made by students. What is differentiated in the new typology proposed is whether a code-switch is made intentionally or involuntarily. Based on the analysis, it is argued that code-switching should not be seen as detrimental to the learning process, even in the learning of languages. Code-switching could be a useful technique in the language classroom for both teachers and students in learning a target language, even if a speaker is switching to a language which is not the target language.

Keywords: Code-switching, code-switching in English language teaching, English-Tagalog code-switching, medium of instruction

1. Code-Switching in Philippine Education

Code-switching is a key and enduring characteristic of the Filipino bilingual repertoire. In her landmark work on English-Tagalog code-switching where she proposed a model of the Filipino bilingual's linguistic competence, Bautista (1980) tells that this 'two co-existent systems' (p. 223) is "a way of life for many Filipinos" (p. 1). Since then, code-switching has been a vibrant line of inquiry in Philippine (socio)linguistics (Bautista, 1991; Dayag & Dita, 2012). Yet quite poignantly, the place and role of code-switching in Philippine education remains a contentious and unresolved issue among policy-makers, scholars, educators, and even the lay people in the Philippines.

The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines mandates that "[f]or purposes of communication and instruction, the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and, until otherwise provided by law, English" (Article XIV, Section 7). Therefore, as a revision to an earlier

1973 policy, then Department of Education, Culture, and Sports promulgated the 1987 Policy on Bilingual Education. The said policy has these goals:

1. Enhanced learning through two languages to achieve quality education as called for by the 1987 Constitution;
2. the propagation of Filipino as a language of literacy;
3. the development of Filipino as a linguistic symbol of national unity and identity;
4. the cultivation and elaboration of Filipino as a language of scholarly discourse, that is to say, its continuing intellectualization; and
5. the maintenance of English as an international language for the Philippines and as a non-exclusive language of science and technology.

The policy therefore instituted Filipino and English as media of instruction, and the regional languages serving as auxiliary media of instruction therein. And in 2013, guidelines were set on the implementation of Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE). MTB-MLE is founded on the premise that students learn best in the language most familiar to them and its goal is "Every Child-A-Reader and A-Writer by Grade 1". The guidelines indicate that the 'mother tongue' will be taught as a subject and, more importantly, be used as the medium of instruction in all subjects except English and Filipino from the first to third grade. Beginning with eight major languages in 2013 identified as 'mother tongues' to be taught and used, these were later on expanded to nineteen languages.

One notices though that the 1987 Policy on Bilingual Education and the 2013 Guidelines on the Implementation of MTB-MLE is silent on the place of code-switching in education—the supposed 'way of life for most [multilingual] Filipinos' (cf. Bautista, 1980) is conspicuously missing in the two important documents on Philippine education. The ideal situation painted by these documents is that the prescribed medium of instruction in a subject will be the language solely used in teaching it. Teachers may be deemed as not following guidelines if caught teaching using another language not assigned to the subject they are teaching, and students may also get to be penalized if they do the same. However, in reality, both teachers and students often switch to another language in classroom instruction. As such, Bernardo (2005) proposes:

> code-switching can be a legitimate and potent resource for learning and teaching for bilingual students and teachers, and that we [Filipinos in general and stakeholders in Philippine education in particular] should relax our language prescription in formal school environments to allow students and teachers to benefit from the use of this *efficacious* resource of developing knowledge and understanding. [emphasis added] (p. 163)

2. The Present Study: Aim and Data

The issue becomes more complex in language classes where, needless to say, there is not only a prescribed medium of instruction but, more importantly, a target language. In English language classes in the Philippines, the standard is that English language teachers must conduct classes only using English. Again, the actual situation is not far from what I have earlier described — that both teachers and students make use of languages other than the prescribed medium of instruction.

And so, I investigate on English-Tagalog code-switching in English language classes in the Philippines. In this study in particular, I analyze the frequency, form, and function of English-

Tagalog code-switching in 14 English language classes in Metro Manila, the Philippines, as I answer the following questions commonly asked regarding code-switching in English language classes in the Philippines: (1) How often do teachers and students in English language classes code-switch? (2) How do teachers and students in English language classes code-switch? (3) Why do teachers and students in English language classes code-switch?

This study extends one I earlier conducted (Borlongan, 2009) on the forms and functions of English-Tagalog code-switching in English language classes, the findings of which are also reported in the third and fourth sections of this article. In the fifth section, I present an analysis of the functions of English-Tagalog code-switching in English language classes in the Philippines following the typologies of Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999, cited in Sert, 2005) for teacher talk and Eldridge (1996) on student talk. The analysis leads me to propose my own typology of functions of English-Tagalog code-switching in English language classes. The typology I propose is an integrated one, which covers both teacher talk and student talk, and this new typology is presented in the sixth section.

For my analysis reported in this article, I utilized the corpus I helped compile as part of a British Council Manila-funded project which assessed the readiness of some Philippine schools to implement a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approach (cf. Dayag, Gustilo, Regala-Flores, Borlongan, & Carreon, 2008). A total of fourteen English language classes from six public elementary schools in Metro Manila, the Philippines, were documented in the corpus and therefore serves as the object of my study, and each of these classes had roughly one hour of recording. Though far from perfect, the corpus—the English language class recordings contained therein, in particular—should provide a good empirical basis for introspecting on English-Tagalog code-switching in English language classes in the Philippines.

3. Frequency of English-Tagalog Code-Switching in English Language Teaching

It is necessary to be able to determine how often teachers and students in English language classes code-switch. More essentially, do teachers and students really code-switch? In Table 1, it could be seen that they indeed code-switch in English language classes.

Eleven out of the fourteen English language teachers, or almost four out of five of them, switched to Tagalog in their classes. Thus said, they digress from the prescribed practice of only using English in teaching the language. Teachers code-switch around less than five to almost fifty times in the fourteen classes in the corpus, and therefore an average of a little less than fifteen per class. And in almost 2,500 utterances of all the English language teachers in the sample, almost 180 utterances contained at least one instance of code-switching. In terms of percentage, almost 7.5% of all the English language teacher speech contained at least one instance of code-switching.

All classes in the corpus had at least one instance of a student code-switching to Tagalog. Students code-switch around more than one to less than fifty times per class session, or a little more than ten, at the average. Almost 150 utterances out of almost 2,000 utterances of all the students in the corpus (or almost seven percent) had an instance of a code-switch.

Could this frequency be considered significant? Or more so, concerning? As existing policy and guidelines rule out the use of other languages besides English in English language classes, that seven percent of the utterances of both teachers and students in the English language classes included in the corpus have code-switches point to the fact that they are way beyond what is expected of the kind of interactions they should have in the classroom, particularly, the language used. The frequency of code-switches in teachers' and students' utterances is therefore worthy of

attention not only in the context of the analysis being made here but also in practice, particularly, to policy-makers and administrators who want them to use only English in English language classes.

Table 1

Frequency of English-Tagalog Code-Switching

Class	Teacher					Students				
	English-Tagalog Code-Switching		English		Total	English-Tagalog Code-Switching		English		Total
	f	%	*f*	%		*f*	%	*f*	%	
1	3	1.42	208	98.58	211	2	2.30	85	97.70	87
2	4	3.23	120	96.77	124	1	0.94	105	99.06	106
3	13	5.39	228	94.61	241	10	4.57	209	95.43	219
4	17	7.23	218	92.77	235	3	0.99	300	99.01	303
5	20	7.30	254	92.70	274	16	7.34	202	92.66	218
6	6	2.94	198	97.06	204	2	1.31	151	98.69	153
7	0	0.00	130	100.00	130	8	5.71	132	94.29	140
8	7	4.67	143	95.33	150	11	19.64	45	80.36	56
9	0	0.00	93	100.00	93	12	12.90	81	87.10	93
10	46	15.97	242	84.03	288	19	7.09	249	92.91	268
11	46	27.06	124	72.94	170	40	22.47	138	77.53	178
12	4	2.74	142	97.26	146	3	2.05	143	97.95	146
13	0	0.00	111	100.00	111	6	5.36	106	94.64	112
14	12	21.43	44	78.57	56	16	25.00	48	75.00	64
Total	**178**	**7.32**	**2,255**	**92.68**	**2,433**	**149**	**6.95**	**1,994**	**93.05**	**2,143**
Ave	**13**	**7.10**	**161**	**92.90**	**174**	**11**	**8.41**	**142**	**91.59**	**153**

I do want to note though that code-switching is not characteristic of all individuals (be it teacher or student). As the corpus makes apparent, a few teachers did not switch to Tagalog at all when teaching English. Of course, I would not know if they did try enough to avoid switching to Tagalog because they know they were being observed and recorded for the British Council Manila-funded project.

4. Forms of English-Tagalog Code-Switching in English Language Teaching

In categorizing the forms of code-switches found in English language classes in the Philippines, Bautista (1998a) used Poplack and Sankoff's (1988) typology, and I found their typology useful, too, in my data for this study because, first of all, Bautista's data and mine document English-Tagalog code-switching and, even if Bautista's data are composed of what is arguably written texts, the style and tone of her data of electronic mails and mine of classroom interactions are almost the same—Bautista herself noted that the electronic mails she analyzed were very conversational in style. In Table 2, I present the forms English-Tagalog code-switching in my corpus.

Table 2

Forms of English-Tagalog Code-Switching

Form	*f*	%	Average per Class
Smooth Code-Switching	260	78.08	19
Constituent Insertion	49	14.71	4
Non-Smooth Switching	6	1.80	0
Nonce Borrowing	18	5.41	1

Smooth code-switches, which involve "changing the language of the sentence only at syntactic boundaries which occur in both languages" (Poplack & Sankoff, 1988, p. 1175), are the most frequent form of code-switching in my corpus. These include (1) switches between a main clause and a noun clause, an adverbial clause, a relative clause, and coordinate clauses, (2) switches to a prepositional phrase in the other language, and (3) switches between a Tagalog verb and an English subject. Four in five switches to Tagalog are smooth switches. I considered sentences in Tagalog from the first word down to the last word as smooth code-switches as both teachers and students should only be using English. Therefore, an utterance purely in Tagalog was still deemed to be an instance of code-switching—an inter-sentential code-switch, to be more specific. Here are a few examples of inter-sentential code-switching in the corpus:

1. Teacher: Okay. Paul mops the floor during Saturday. Who else? Merille.
   Student: Teacher, *may nag-away po*. 'Teacher, *someone got caught in a fight*.'
2. Student 1: *Anong color?* 'What color?'
   Student 2: Blue.
3. Teacher: Mark Anthony. Mmm. Alright. Very good. Next, next.
   Student: Ma'am, *'di pa ako natatawag*. 'Ma'am, *I have not been called yet*.'

Other instances of smooth switches are below:

4. Why is this with correction already? We haven't checked. *Ba't may mga check na'to? Hindi pa tayo nagtse-check eh.* 'Why is this with correction already? We haven't checked. *Why does this already have corrections? We haven't checked [it].*'
5. Ah, so you'd like to know what else? *Ano pa ang gusto mong malaman diyaan*? 'Ah, so you'd like to know what else? *What else would you like to know about that?*'
6. Hello! Listen, children. *Alam ko gutom na kayo!* 'Hello! Listen, children. *I know you are already hungry.*'
7. Be careful! *Andito ang pandikit ninyo, o.* ' Be careful! *Your glue is here.*'

Constituent insertions are the second most frequent form of code-switching in the corpus. These are "the insertion of a grammatical constituent, in a sentence of the other language" (Poplack & Sankoff, 1988, p. 1176) and appear as tag expressions, enclitics, and the Tagalog adverbial *parang* 'like' in Bautista's (1998a) data. These now are some examples of constituent insertion in the corpus:

8. Okay… Now… *Sige*… Please be the next… 'Okay… Now… *Go*… Be the next…'
9. Just raise your hand *lang*. 'Just raise your hand *only*.'
10. *Uy*! Sit down *nga eh*. '*Hey*! *The teacher* said sit down.'

The last example above seems to be unique case because the English free translation already has a subject. Among other things, the Tagalog adverbial particle *nga* is also a particle of reiteration and so the student who uttered the sentence no longer indicated an explicit subject as it follows a teacher's order to sit down.

Another form of code-switching, according to Poplack and Sankoff's (1988) typology, is nonce borrowings. These are "single lexical items, syntactically and morphologically (if not always phonologically) integrated into the recipient language, but also because eligible words are of the same type: largely nouns, with some representation of other content words (verbs, adverbs, and adjectives), but no pronouns, articles, prepositions, or other function words" (p. 1176). Of course, teachers and students borrowed words from Tagalog because a particular word has no (close, semantic) equivalent in English and/or the speaker wants to achieve some pragmatic and even perhaps stylistic effect to which only the Tagalog word could bring out. Here are some nonce borrowings in the corpus:

11. Ginger is also an example of herb. Some plants cling to the wall or climb terraces. Okay, they are called vines. What are examples of vines according to our story? Oh yes, Santsy. Vines, *kalabasa*. Read. Read it. Okay. *Patola*. Okay, next–shrubs. What do you call shrubs–a woody plant in a tree? Oh, Sophia. 'Ginger is also an example of herb. Some plants cling to the wall or climb terraces. Okay, they are called vines. What are examples of vines according to our story? Oh yes, Santsy. Vines. Squash. Read. Read it. Okay. *Sponge gourd*. Okay, next – shrubs. What do you call shrubs – a woody plant in a tree? Oh, Sophia.'
12. Students: Good morning, visitor!
    Teacher and Students: Welcome…
    Students: And *mabuhay*! [Tagalog welcome greeting with no English translation]

13. Okay, you are going to write the correct answer. Number one. Read first the sentence before answering. Read first the sentence. Answer number one. Will you take your seat? Just raise your hand. Jasper. Yes, *hija*? Read the first sentence. Hmmm. Read. [An affectionate term (originally from Spanish) to refer to a girl]

I have to note here that the borrowings in the utterances above could already be considered part of the lexicon of Philippine English, following Bautista (1997, 1998b) and Borlongan (2007).

In her data of electronic mails, Bautista (1998a) records no instance of non-smooth switching, those "marked at the discourse level by pauses, hesitation phenomena, metalinguistic commentaries, and other means of drawing attention to the switch, with the result of interrupting the smooth production of the sentence at the switch point" (Poplack & Sankoff, 1988, p. 1176). I do have a few instances of this form in the corpus understandably because, even if I said that the style and tone of Bautista's data and mine are comparable, mine is still more spontaneous while electronic mails could have gone through some self-editing and superficial screening of the writer. The following are some of the utterances in the corpus containing non-smooth switches:

14. Yesterday. Now… Okay… Sige… Now, let us change the names with your real names. And let us change yesterday by last Saturday. What did you do last Saturday? Okay, I need two girls. Okay, Christine Joy and Shane. Okay, Shane will be Dolly and Christine Joy will be… *Ay*… Christine Joy will be Joy. Okay. And change this one to last Saturday. Okay, Shane, what did you do last Saturday, Joy? 'Yesterday. Now… Okay… Okay… Now, let us change the names with your real names. And let us change yesterday by last Saturday. What did you do last Saturday? Okay, I need two girls. Okay, Christine Joy and Shane. Okay, Shane will be Dolly and Christine Joy will be… *Oh*… Christine Joy will be Joy. Okay. And change this one to last Saturday. Okay, Shane, what did you do last Saturday, Joy?'
15. Okay, who'd like to pick one? May I call on? Yes, Kyle, come here. You pick one word inside the box and you do the action. Do not show your *ano*, okay? O, take a look at Kyle. 'Okay, who'd like to pick one? May I call on? Yes, Kyle, come here. You pick one word inside the box and you do the action. Do not show your *what*, okay? O, take a look at Kyle'
16. Yung *ano*, yung book with this drawing. It's on page 172. This book, with this kind of drawing. O, you look at the drawing *ha*. It is on page 172. 'The *what*, the book with this drawing. It's on page 172. This book, with this kind of drawing. Okay, you look at the drawing. It is on page 172.'

5. Functions of English-Tagalog Code-Switching in English Language Teaching, Based on Previous Typologies

In teaching and learning English (and any language, for that matter), the ultimate goal will always be to eventually be able to proficiently and accurately use the language. Why then should any other language aside from the target language be used in (English) language classes? I now answer this question by identifying the functions of English-Tagalog code-switching found in my corpus. This section is further subdivided into two subsections: The first sub-section deals with the functions of code-switching on the part of the teacher following the typology devised by Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999, cited in Sert, 2005) while the second sub-section talks about the functions of students' code-switches basing on the typology of Eldridge (1996). I used these typologies in the (preliminary) analysis of my current data instead of the more popular typologies

for the functions of code-switching such as that of Gumperz (1977) and, later on applied to the case of English-Tagalog code-switching, Bautista (1999, 2004) and Pascasio (1978), because the typologies I selected are more adept to the context of a language class, compared to Gumperz' and Bautista's, which looked at code-switching from a broader perspective and non-classroom context (or, at least, in a context different from a language class).

5.1 Functions of Code-Switches of Teachers

Sert (2005), in giving an overview of the functions of code-switching in English language classes, cites Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999) in his typology of functions of teachers' code-switches. Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson identified three functions: (1) Topic switch, (2) affective function, and (3) repetitive function. Topic switches alter teachers' language with reference to the topic. Sert (2005) mentions of situations in grammar classes when the teacher would have to switch to another language (the students' language, usually) when shifting from one grammatical structure to another, and code-switching is usually done to highlight the said shift. These instances bridge the "unknown" (¶ 8)–the target language–from the "known" (¶ 8)–the students' language. Sert also cites Cole (1998) for the latter's suggestion for teachers to exploit students' previous first language acquisition and learning experience in acquiring and learning a second. The second function of code-switching in language classes is affective function, when the switching is done to establish solidarity and rapport among and with the students. And the third is repetitive function of code-switching, when the code-switching is used by the teacher to clarify meaning. However, the tendency to repeat the instruction in the first language may lead to some undesired student behavior; a learner who is sure that instruction in the target language will be followed by first language translation may lose interest in listening to the instruction in the target language.

Shown in Table 3 are the frequencies of these functions in the corpus. A column labeled 'others' is devoted for code-switches which do not categorically belong to any of the functions identified by Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999, cited in Sert, 2005).

Table 3

Functions of Code-Switches of Teachers

Function	***f***	**%**	**Average per Class**
Topic Switch	0	0.00	0
Affective Function	13	5.75	1
Repetitive Function	28	12.39	2
Others	185	81.86	13

The first and second functions of English-Tagalog code-switching in the utterances of the teachers hardly occurred in the data: English language teachers in the Philippines switched to Tagalog to reiterate what has been said in English close to 30 times, or a little more than 12% of all the teacher code-switches. Therefore, each teacher repeated for clarification twice on the average. Much less are code-switches with the affective function, occurring only a little more than ten times in the corpus or about six percent of all the teachers' code-switches. That is just an

average of one per class but, from Table 3, not all classes did code-switch affectively; there were only four classes that did, with one class even monopolizing this function of teachers' code-switches. Code-switches which function as topic switches did not occur at all in the data.

Quite surprisingly, most of the teacher code-switches recorded in the corpus do not fall under any of the functions identified by Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999, cited in Sert, 2005). Close to 200 switches or 80 percent are not any of the three functions. I will elaborate on this in the next section. In the meantime, some examples of the repetitive function are provided below:

17. Make it fast! *Bilisan mo*! 'Make it fast! *You make it fast*!'
18. Why is this with correction already? We haven't checked. *Ba't may mga check na'to? Hindi pa tayo nagtse-scheck eh*. 'Why is this with correction already? We haven't checked. *Why does this already have corrections? We haven't checked [it]*.'
19. Ah, so you'd like to know what else? Ano pa ang gusto mong malaman diyaan? 'Ah, so you'd like to know what else? *What else would you like to know about that?*'

Those which bear an affective function are exemplified by the following:

20. Okay, you are going to write the correct answer. Number one. Read first the sentence before answering. Read first the sentence. Answer number one. Will you take your seat? Just raise your hand. Jasper. Yes, *hija*? Read the first sentence. Hmmm. Read. [An affectionate term (originally from Spanish) to refer to a girl]
21. Patricia. Patricia, just sit down. Just sit down, *anak*. 'Patricia. Patricia, just sit down. Just sit down, *child*.'
22. Okay, you're very good. You're so *makulit* – naughty *ha*? Andrea… Hmmm… Okay, read it first. 'Okay, you're very good. You're so *naughty* – naughty huh? Andrea… Hmmm… Okay, read it first.'

The first two utterances above exemplify the affective function of the teachers' code-switches through vocatives, or addresses to the addressee, and, in those cases, the students. The last example presents an interesting instance when the teacher is somehow surprised by the answer supplied by the student whom the teacher called. The teacher found the answer naughty, but, to downplay the perhaps sarcastic tone of the remark and make it appear more playful instead, the teacher borrowed the Tagalog word first before giving its English equivalent, which also appears like the repetitive function

5.2 Functions of Code-Switches of Students

While teacher code-switching causes alarm because it means teachers themselves are not following the policies in implementation, students switching to their first language in a class with a target language different from the students' first language has mostly been worrisome to Filipino educators because this is seen as a manifestation of low(er) levels of proficiency in the target language, viewing code-switching more as a fallback option when the discourse can no longer be pursued in the target language. I did a preliminary analysis of student code-switches following the classification earlier proposed by Eldridge (1996) using a Turkish secondary school as data. Eldridge identified seven functions for the code-switches of students: (1) Equivalence, (2) floor-holding, (3) metalanguage, (4) reiteration, (5) group membership, (6) conflict control, and (7)

alignment and disalignment. Equivalence is similar to nonce borrowing, as can be seen in this example:

23. Teacher, cave–it means in Turkish *magara*? 'Teacher, cave–it means in Turkish *cave*?'

Eldridge (1996) also mentions of the borrowing of floor-holding devices from Turkish to English:

24. Where did Robert? *Ondan sonra? Neydi?* 'Where did Robert? *After that? What was it?*'

Instances when 'floor-holding devices are used are when the student can no longer retrieve the appropriate word in English, and thus resorts to his/her first language. The metalanguage function of code-switching is used when the speaker shifts from the topic of the discourse from the class subject matter to the task at hand. For example:

25. A: Where did Gary go?
    B: Ben sorucagim: Where did Gary go? '*Ben sorucagim:* Where did Gary go?'

Similar to the teachers' repetitive function, there is also reiteration for students:

26. Teacher: Flowers.
    Student: Flowers. *Cicek*. 'Flowers. *Flowers.*'

Code-switching is also used to emphasize solidarity or membership in a group. This comes close to the affective function on the part of the teachers, as can be seen in this example:

27. I like speak half Turkish, half English. For example, my bestfriend *im*. 'I like speak half Turkish, half English. For example, my bestfriend *my*.' [The student provides an example as to how s/he does code-switching, and he gave as an example kinship terms.

Eldridge (1996) provides yet another example–the Turkish discourse particle *yani* 'that is' in this utterance:

28. I like being corrected *yani* because I learn *yani*. 'I like being corrected *that is* because I learn *that is*.'

At first, it might sound as if it has a floor-holding function but the one in the final position neither holds the floor nor adds anything which led Eldridge to conclude that the particle was inserted simply to infuse some "Turkishness" (p. 307) in the utterance. He also cites conflict control as a function of students' code-switches, and these are instances when a word in one language was favored more than its equivalent in the other language because of the precision of the former and the ambiguity of the latter. He did not have any instance of this in his data, but he cites one student who said that he would rather use the word *liar* in English than its Turkish equivalent because it is less derogatory in the second language than in the first. There is, however, one instance when the utterance is in the first language and the shift is to the second.

The last function of code-switches among students is alignment and disalignment. This function is utilized when the student code-switches to align himself/herself to the conversation or to attempt to make a shift in the conversation:

29. A: What did you do yesterday?
    B: *Neden siz…?* '*Why are you…?*' [The utterance creates a slight commotion.]
    C: Be quiet.
    D: Please be quiet, friends.

Table 4 presents the frequencies of these functions in my own corpus.

Table 4

Functions of Code-Switches of Students

Function	***f***	**%**	**Average per Class**
Equivalence	0	0.00	0
Floor-Holding	0	0.00	0
Metalanguage	89	74.17	6
Reiteration	1	0.83	0
Group Membership	0	0.00	0
Conflict Control	0	0.00	0
Alignment and Disalignment	3	2.50	0
Others	27	22.50	2

Based on Table 4, the metalanguage function of students' code-switching is the most frequent of all the categories, following Eldridge's classification. Of the more than a hundred code-switches made by the students in the corpus, almost ninety are of the metalanguage function or close to three-quarters of all the code-switches made by the students. Undoubtedly, most students code-switch when they shift from the subject matter to the task at hand, as in these examples from the corpus:

30. So *babasahin lahat*? 'So *everything will be read*?'
31. *Bilis mo!* '*You make it fast!*'
32. Yes, binigyan na tayo ng star! '*Yes, we have already been given a star!*'

These examples are somehow representative of the students' code-switches in the corpus whose function is metalanguage; most of them are in the form of inter-sentential code-switching, which even shows that there seems to be a complete shift in terms of language too, once the topic of conversation shifts from the subject matter to the task at hand.

Fourteen instances of the code-switches of the students do not fall under any of the categories of Eldridge's (1996) typology. These fourteen instances are the second largest lump of

code-switches in Table 4. As with the functions of teacher's code-switches, these fourteen instances will be discussed more elaborately in the following section.

A category which comes close to the function of metalanguage is alignment and disalignment. All instances of alignment and disalignment in the corpus, which are also all reproduced below, are related to the task at hand in class. In fact, these utterances could be conveniently categorized as functioning as metalanguage:

33. Uy! Get your assignment notebook nga daw eh! '*Hey! The teacher said get your assignment notebook!*'
34. Uy, tama na… Eto… Dito… Eto muna… '*Hey, it's enough… This… Here… Here… This one first…*'
35. Bilisan niyo! '*Make it fast!*'

There was but one instance of reiteration in the corpus. This happened when the teacher seemed to have failed to accurately hear what one student said, and another student had to repeat what the other student said:

36. Nail… Nail… *Pako daw po!* Nail… *Pako.* 'Nail… Nail… *He said nail*! Nail… *Nail.*'

There was no instance of some of the functions identified by Eldridge (1996), namely, equivalence, floor-holding, group membership, and conflict control. These seemingly absent functions in the corpus will be explained in the following section.

6. A New Typology of the Functions of English-Tagalog Code-Switching in English Language Teaching

In the previous section, I tried to answer the question *Why do teachers and students in English language classes code-switch?* using the typologies provided by Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999) for teacher code-switches and Eldridge (1996) for student code-switches. As I did my initial analysis using the two typologies, I felt that the two typologies are wanting for several reasons. First, there were a lot – in fact, a significant number – of teacher and student code-switches could not be categorized in any of the functions identified by Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson and Eldridge. Close to 85% of the teachers' code-switches were simply categorized as 'others' in the two typologies while almost one-fourth of students' code-switches were also categorized as 'others'. And most of the primary, significant function of the code-switches made by the teachers were the teachers

Second, some of the categories were actually overlapping. Take for example, the function alignment and disalignment could simply be categorized as metalanguage. The examples given for the former category are once again reproduced here:

37. Uy! Get your assignment notebook nga daw eh! '*Hey! The teacher said get your assignment notebook!*'
38. Uy, tama na… Eto… Dito… Eto muna… '*Hey, it's enough… This… Here… Here… This one first…*'
39. Bilisan niyo! '*Make it fast!*'

I believe that all of the utterances above could simply be considered as belonging to the metalanguage function of student code-switching. The first example addressed to another student was meant to direct the other student to follow the teacher's instruction to get the notebook. The speaker aligns the addressee to the general classroom discourse but at the same time it was also meant to talk about the task at hand and reiterate what has just been said by the teacher as regards the task at hand. The second example also redirects the addressee to a more important task (or segment of the task) which may qualify the same utterance to be functioning as metalanguage. The last example was but a simple utterance which gets back its addressees to the task at hand and commands them to finish the task a lot faster than how they were doing it then. This may be the perfect borderline case exemplifying an utterance being both alignment and disalignment and metalanguage functions all at the same time. Though before proposing the typology he came up with, Eldridge (1996) warned that many switches may either be multi-functional or "open to different functional interpretations" (p. 305), I believe that the examples above is way beyond the multi-functionality that he is talking about. While switches could be multi-functional, they cannot all be multi-functional — or as frequent as in the corpus, if the typologies used in the analysis are strictly followed — or else, the typology will simply be invalid as it is unable to serve its purpose of neatly classifying code-switches into their supposed functions.

Third, some functions identified by Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999) and Eldridge (1996)—and quite a number of them—are not attested at all in the corpus. While it is possible that my corpus was merely not sufficient enough to be able to allow for at least a few attestations of these missing functions or they basically are not found in the English language classes in the Philippines at all, it seems that it is more of the latter than of the former.

Fourth, the two earlier typologies (Eldridge, 1996; Mattsson & Burenhult-Mattsson, 1999) did not account for code-switches which is caused by lack of competence in English. Though code-switching could be used as a resource in teaching and learning, there remains instances when code-switching ultimately becomes an undesirable fallback because the student—or even the teacher—can no longer continue what s/he is trying to say in English and thus switches to Tagalog.

Going beyond the categories devised by Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999) and Eldridge (1996): There also seem to be a problem with the assignment of a pragmatic function for each of the code-switches found in the corpus because not all are functionally-driven, voluntarily-uttered, as in the following example:

40. Teacher: What else? What else can you give to your… Uhm… Example, inside uh this school. Yes?
    Student: *Tulungan po ang matanda tumawid.* 'Help the elderly to cross (the street).'

In the above example, the student can never be accused of being incapable of answering in English, because in the way the discourse progressed, there is no evidence that he does not know what to say: There is no word-finding pause and he did not even stutter. Perhaps, the only explanation for the code-switch is simply that the language which was immediately activated was Tagalog, and not English.

Given these ramifications after the analysis initially guided by the framework of Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999) and Eldridge (1996) on the functions of code-switching in English language classes, there seems to be a compelling need to reorganize the typologies used and contextualize it for English language classes in the Philippines. A new typology is therefore proposed here and it is one which integrates functions of code-switches made by teachers and

code-switches made by students. Overlaps could be seen in the typologies of Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson and Eldridge. And given the favoring of instructional theory to the so-called student-centered instruction, classroom discourse should nevertheless reflect symmetrical relationship between teachers and students as co-interlocutors in the said type of discourse. What is differentiated in the typology I am proposing, which the previous typologies did not consider, is whether a code-switch is made voluntarily or involuntarily. **Involuntary code-switches** refer to code-switches which were unconsciously uttered. These code-switches were not controlled by the speaker. The Tagalog utterance simply came out automatically and spontaneously without an explicit intention to cod-switch on the part of the speaker. Involuntary code-switches may be **processing-driven**, when the activation of the concept is much earlier — or even much faster — in Tagalog than in English or the concept was simply retrieved in Tagalog and not in English at that moment in time, and this happens not because the speaker does not have the lexical item in English but simply retrieval happened in Tagalog first. However, involuntary code-switches may also be **proficiency-driven**, in instances when the particular item does not exist in the speaker's English lexicon and only available in Tagalog.

On the other end, **intentional code-switches** happens based on the consciousness of speaker to achieve a certain purpose s/he has in mind, and may have four functions: (1) Topic (re)orientation, (2) stylistically-driven formulation, (3) discourse management, and (4) nonce borrowing. **Topic (re)orientation** refers to code-switches which were uttered to signify a change in the topic of discussion and this change can either be (a) within the subject matter or (b) a shift from the subject matter to the task at hand (or vice versa). The code-switch itself was used as a marker of change in topic, or a transition marker, so to speak. This category is similar to Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson's (1999) topic switch, which focuses only on switches on the subject matter or content in their typology. This category in the new typology proposed also includes topic shift from subject matter to task; therefore, this category subsumes the category metalanguage in Eldridge's (1996) typology.

The new typology also has the category **stylistically-driven formulations**. These formulations are code-switches which are uttered simply to achieve some stylistic effect in one's utterance. Perhaps, the best example of this category is what Bautista (1998a) referred to as '*maarteng* English' (p. 139) or English with affectation. But this category also includes code-switches which are made for affective reasons, which is actually more frequent than English with affectation. This may include borrowing kinship terms in Tagalog but smooth, inter-sentential code-switching could also be utilized for this function.

Switching from English to Tagalog is also done when one tries to manage the discourse in progress, and so another category is **discourse management**. This mostly takes the form of repetition; that is, translating what was just said in English to Tagalog to assure comprehension or simply to reiterate what was just said. Obviously, this is similar to Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson's (1999) repetition and Eldridge's (1996) reiteration. This function could also take the form of repair, either self-initiated (correcting oneself) or other-initiated (being asked to clarify what one has just said). It is also in this category where code-switches made as a fallback option to lack of competence in English falls. However, to set this apart from proficiency-driven switches earlier described, this intentional switch is within the consciousness and volition of the speaker. This was included in this category because those switches are made to avoid breakdowns in the discourse in progress. It could be outright shift to Tagalog or simply the use of Tagalog floor-holding devices, similar to Eldridge's floor-holding function of the code-switches of students.

The last category in the proposed typology is **nonce borrowing**. These are code-switches made to compensate for lack of an equivalent lexical item in English. Therefore, the switch to Tagalog or any language, for that matter, is necessary and could not be avoided and is not simply because the speaker does not have a word for it in English, as in the case of proficiency-driven involuntary switches.

The new typology of the functions of English-Tagalog code-switching in English language classes I am proposing could be summarized as follows:

A. Involuntary Code-Switching: Code-switches which are unconsciously uttered and not controlled by the speaker
   6. Processing-Driven Switch: Code-switches occurring when the activation of the concept is much earlier or faster in Tagalog than in English or the concept was simply retrieved in Tagalog and not in English at that moment in time
   7. Proficiency-Driven Switch: Code-switches occurring when the particular item does not exist in the speaker's English lexicon and only available in Tagalog

B. Intentional Code-Switching: Code-switches happening based on the consciousness of speaker to achieve a certain purpose s/he has in mind
   8. Topic (Re)Orientation: Code-switches which were uttered to signify a change in the topic of discussion, a change which can either be (a) within the subject matter or (b) a shift from the subject matter to the task at hand (or vice versa)
   9. Stylistically-Driven Formulation: Code-switches which are uttered to achieve some stylistic effect in one's utterance
   10. Discourse Management: Code-switches used to manage the discourse in progress, including instances when the speaker could no longer continue his/her utterance in English so s/he reverts to Tagalog
   11. Nonce Borrowing: Code-switches made to compensate for lack of an equivalent lexical item in English, and is usually for Philippine cultural items

7. Summary and Discussion

Code-switching is an important facet of the bilingual competence of Filipinos and a key feature of their linguistic repertoire. However, the place and role of code-switching in teaching and learning remains an issue, and even more contentious in classes where languages are taught and learned. In this study, I investigated on the frequency, forms, and functions of English-Tagalog code-switching in English language classes in public elementary schools in Metro Manila. Most of the English language teachers in the corpus do code-switch, which seems to be a digression from prescriptions of implementing policy and guidelines on media of instruction. Students likewise code-switch in their English language classes. Though code-switching in the corpus occurred frequently, the tendency to code-switch appears to be more of an individual-specific disposition rather than a characteristic which could be attributed to all the teachers and students documented in the corpus. English-Tagalog code-switching in my data mostly in the form of smooth switching.

Following an analysis initially utilizing the typologies of Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999) on the functions of the code-switches of teachers and Eldridge (1996), I propose a new typology to be able to better capture the psycho-sociolinguistic reality of English language classes in the Philippines. The new typology is a unified one, which does not distinguish code-switches made by teachers and those by students. What is differentiated in the new typology proposed is whether a code-switch is made intentionally or involuntarily. Involuntary code-switches are

unconsciously uttered and uncontrolled by the speaker. The code-switch simply came out automatically and spontaneously without an explicit intention to code-switch on the part of the speaker. This may perhaps be caused by the activation of the concept much earlier—or even much faster—in Tagalog than in English, or the concept was simply retrieved in Tagalog and not in English at that moment in time. And then, there are intentional code-switches which are uttered voluntarily and consciously made by the speaker (and with him/her having a specific purpose in mind for code-switching, and my analysis suggests four primary functions for intentional code-switching: (1) Topic (re)orientation, (2) stylistically-driven formulation, (3) discourse management, and (4) nonce borrowing.

My analysis was driven by pedagogical questions but, as a student of sociolinguistics myself, I wish to also hinge the discussion of my findings within sociolinguistic theorizing. I go back to what Bautista (1980) early on envisaged for the study of English-Tagalog code-switching: That a comprehensive modeling of the bilingual competence of Filipinos based on an analysis of code-switching must include these few aspects earlier mentioned by Hymes (1967): "[W]hat code is used, where and when, among whom, for what purpose, and with what result, to say what, in what way, subject to what norms of interaction and of interpretation as instances of what speech acts and genres of speaking" (p. 8). Bautista discussed (un)grammaticality in English-Tagalog code-switching and, also in the spirit of Stell and Yakpo's (2015) multidimensional approach to the study of code-switching, I now turn to what these switches are worth for. My analysis makes apparent that code-switching, at least among Filipinos, and particularly in the context of English language classes, serve an important purpose. Code-switching facilitates communication and, more importantly, allows both teachers and students to draw upon their rich linguistic resources to enable teaching and learning not only of content but also of language itself, too. Contemporary applied linguistics would even offer the term 'translanguaging' (cf. Wei, 2018) to refer to this phenomenon.

Bilinguals are able to switch from one language to another smoothly whether intentionally or involuntarily. This ability is a natural outcome of bilingualism, when one is highly proficient in two languages. One could not possibly switch from one language to another if they are not very proficient in any of the two. More importantly, these switches serve a purpose, and the selection of one language over the other to achieve a certain purpose is a manifestation of a bilingual's well-developed communicative and sociolinguistic competence. A bilingual is likewise well-aware that code-switching is only effective when his/her co-interlocutor is also able to draw from the same linguistic resource (or put simply, another language) to achieve the goals of their communicative situation. That is not to say that some code-switches are an outcome of a bilingual's inability to produce specific linguistic items or structures in one language and so s/he therefore draws upon his/her resources in another. But this is natural and happens even among highly proficient bilinguals, and even among monolinguals (but the latter must try to cope without another language as fallback)!

Also as a student of world Englishes in particular, I see code-switching as within the continuum in which a speaker of a new English competently and comfortably moves along to achieve a communicative purpose. In Philippine English, this less formal, more relaxed style is often in the form of English-Tagalog code-switching rather than purely English (cf. Lee & Borlongan, in press). Code-switching as an aspect of the developmental trajectory and evolutionary dynamics of Philippine English is not only a key characteristic but more so a necessary feature of this new English which has arisen in the Philippines (cf. Borlongan, in press).

I hope that this analysis of mine on English-Tagalog code-switching is also a contribution to the description of Philippine English.

Based on the foregoing discussion, code-switching should therefore not be seen as detrimental to the learning process, even in the learning of languages. Code-switching could be a useful technique in the language classroom for both teachers and students in learning a target language, even if a speaker is switching to a language which is not the target language.

8. Implications and Recommendations

In this article, I point out that, as my analysis makes evident, English-Tagalog code-switching serves a variety of functions and does not necessarily mean lack of competence in English. I am inclined to believe that, in consonance with Bernardo's (2005, 2007) earlier proposals, code-switching must be used with a purpose, and could even be utilized as a resource in the teaching and learning, even in English language classes in the Philippines. Teachers and students code-switching in English language classes must not be seen as bad practice but rather as a normal, acceptable habit bilinguals do with their linguistic repertoire. I therefore ask a few questions to help in reflecting on the current implementing policy and guidelines on language use in Philippine education, but particularly in (English) language classes: Do policies and guidelines reflect the psycho-sociolinguistic reality of multilingualism in the Philippines? Do these language-in-education policies and guidelines facilitate teaching and learning in schools? How do these policies and guidelines allow for and hone the use of the various language resources multilinguals have?

While there may not be a need to rewrite these policies and guidelines to clearly state the place and role of code-switching in classroom instruction, teachers—and not only language teachers but all teachers—must be trained to be able to utilize code-switching as a resource of their bilingual students. Specifically, they must be trained how to respond to instances when code-switching is not the acceptable practice in a particular classroom situation, e.g., the language teacher asking students to deliver a formal speech (though some formal speeches like state of the nation addresses are now being code-switched, too) or the student failing to express his/her ideas in the target language. In situations like the latter, recasts or scaffolding or the so-called 'code-scaffolding/pedagogic code-switching' (Fennema-Bloom, 2010) should be a useful technique to use on the teacher's end. Therefore, they must be trained in these multilingual environment-appropriate teaching strategies. Pedagogically speaking, therefore, code-switching should be accorded the 'entitlement' it deserves in the classroom, as long as it does not hinder learning and teaching, most especially that of English.

Future studies are invited to test the validity of the proposed typology of the functions of code-switching in language teaching. The model, though derived from an analysis of a corpus, is still based on a limited sample. It should be applied to other larger datasets to determine whether it could speak for other language teaching and learning contexts. It might also be insightful and necessary to go back to teachers and students who are being observed for studies such as this, to ask them why they code-switch at that particular instance to be able to give a more holistic account of what transpired in the teaching and learning process, and this is something that this study was not able to do because of its being corpus-based. Lastly, the typology should also be elaborated on in more psycholinguistic terms, through studies employing more experimental designs, most especially why some code-switches are voluntary and some are not, why it is faster to access some concepts in Tagalog than in English, or any other languages in a bilingual context, for that matter.

References

Bautista, M. L. S. (1980). *The Filipino bilingual's competence: A model based on an analysis of Tagalog-English code switching*. Canberra, Australia: Pacific Linguistics.

Bautista, M. L. S. (1991). Code-switching studies in the Philippines. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *88*, 19-32.

Bautista, M. L. S. (1997). The lexicon of Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context (Proceedings of the Conference held in Manila on August 2-3, 1996)* (pp. 49-72). Manila, the Philippines: Macquarie Library Pty Ltd.

Bautista, M. L. S. (1998a). Another look at Tagalog-English code-switching. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Pagtanaw: Essays on language in honor of Teodoro A Llamzon* (pp. 121-146). Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Bautista, M. L. S. (1998b). Tagalog-English code-switching and the lexicon of Philippine English. *Asian Englishes*, *1*(1), 51-67.

Bautista, M. L. S. (1999). An analysis of the functions of Tagalog-English code switching: Data from one case. In M. L. S. Bautista & G. O. Tan (Eds.), *The Filipino bilingual: A multidisciplinary perspective (Festschrift in honor of Emy M. Pascasio)* (pp. 19-31). Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Bautista, M. L. S. (2004). Tagalog-English code switching as a mode of discourse. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *5*, 226-233.

Bernardo, A. B. I. (2005). Bilingual code-switching as a resource for learning and teaching: Alternative reflections on the language and education issue in the Philippines. In D. T. Dayag & J. S. Quakenbush (Eds.), *Linguistics and language education in the Philippines and beyond: A festschrift in honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista* (pp. 151-169). Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Bernardo, A. B. I. (2007). Language in Philippine education: Rethinking old fallacies, exploring new alternatives amidst globalization. In T. R. F. Tupas (Ed.), *(Re)making society: The politics of language, discourse, and identity in the Philippines* (pp. 1-26). Quezon City, the Philippines: The University of the Philippines Press.

Borlongan, A. M. (2007). Innovations in Standard Philippine English. In C. C. Mann (Ed.), *Current research on English and applied linguistics: A De La Salle University special issue* (pp. 1-36). Manila, the Philippines: Department of English and Applied Linguistics, De La Salle University-Manila.

Borlongan, A. M. (2009). Tagalog-English code-switching in English language teaching: Frequency and forms. *TESOL Journal*, *1*, 28-42.

Borlongan, A. M. (in press). Conspectus. In A. M. Borlongan (Ed.), *Philippine English:Development, structure, and sociology of English in the Philippines*. London, the United Kingdom: Routledge.

Cole, S. (1998). The use of L1 in communicative English classrooms. *The Language Teacher*, *22*, 11-13.

Dayag, D. T. & Dita, S. N. (2012). Linguistic research in the Philippines: Trends, prospects and challenges. In V. A. Miralao & J. B. Agbisit (Eds.), *Philippine social sciences: Capacities, directions, and challenges* (pp. 110-126). Quezon, the Philippines: Philippine Social Science Council.

Dayag, D. T., Gustilo, L. E., Regala-Flores, E., Borlongan, A. M., Carreon, M. E. C. (2008). *Classroom discourse in selected Philippine primary schools: A corpus-based analysis of*

language use. Accessible from the British Council website: http://www.britishcouncil.org/philippines-common-report-classroom-discourse.pdf

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

Fennema-Bloom, J. R. (2010). Code-scaffolding: A pedagogic codeswitching technique for bilingual content instruction. *Journal of Education*, *190*(3), 27-35.

Gumperz, J. J. (1977). The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching. *RELC Journal*, *8*(2), 1-34.

Hymes, D. (1967). Models of the interaction of language and social setting. *Journal of Social Issues*, *23*, 8-28.

Lee, A. P., & Borlongan, A. M. (in press). Internal variation. In A. M. Borlongan (Ed.), *Philippine English:Development, structure, and sociology of English in the Philippines*. London, the United Kingdom: Routledge.

Mattsson, A., & Burenhult-Mattsson, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers*, *47*, 59-72.

Pascasio, E. M. (1978). Dynamics of code switching in the business domain. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, *9*, 40-50.

Poplack, S. V., & Sankoff, D. (1988). Code-switching. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, & K. Mattheier (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society* (Vol. 2, pp. 1173-1180). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *XI*(8).

Stell, G., & Yakpo, K. (Eds.). (2015). *Code-switching between structural and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin, Germany: Walter De Gruyter.

Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*, 9–30.