In the Name of God

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....III

Dedication.....IV

Table of Contents.....V

List of Tables.....VIII

List of Figures IX

List of Abbreviations X

List of Appendices XI

Abstract 1

Chapter One: Background and Purpose.....2

1.1 Background.....3

1.2 Statement of the Problem.....6

1.3 Research Question.....10

1.4 Research Hypothesis.....11

1.5 Definition of the Key Terms.....11

1.6 Significance of the Study 12

1.7 Delimitations of the Study.....13

Chapter Two: Review of the Related Literature.....15

2.1 Introduction 16

2.2 Different Definitions of Code Switching.....17

2.3 Code-Switching, Code-Mixing, and Borrowing.....19

2.4 Views on Code Switching.....23

2.4.1 Sociolinguistic Approaches.....23

2.4.2 Linguistic Approaches.....26

2.4.3 Conversational Approaches.....29

2.5 Types of Code Switching.....33

2.6 Functions of Code-Switching.....37

2.6.1 Conversational Functions of Code-Switching…….…….……38

2.6.2 Discourse-Related and Participant-Related code-switching…….42

2.7 Code-switching in Classrooms…….……44

2.7.1 Classroom Discourse…….……45

2.7.2 Functions of Code-switching in Classrooms…….……49

2.8 Research on Code-switching in Language Classrooms…….……..….....55

2.8.1 Views on Code-switching in Language Classrooms…….……..…. ..55

2.8.2 Code-Switching in Bilingual Classrooms…….....58

2.8.3 Code-switching in Foreign Language Classroom.…….59

2.8.4 Studies on Code-switching in Iran…….65

Chapter Three: Methodology….…….……...…….....71

3.1 Participants……...……...…..……..71

3.2 Instrumentation…….…….……..…....……...72

3.2.1 Preliminary English Test (PET)……..…….…….…..72

3.2.2 Pre and Post Test Instrument (Pretest and Posttest of speaking accuracy)…….…73

3.3 Procedure…….…….…….…….……..……..73

3.4 Design ……..……..…….……77

.3.5 Data Analysis..…….…….…….78

Chapter Four: Data analysis and Discussion…….…….…….....79

4.1 Homogeneity Process (Pretest)……..80

4.1.1Validation Process and Pilot study of Preliminary English Test (PET)……..80

4.1.2 Participant-Selection Statistics……80

4.1.3 Homogeneity Process……..81

4.2 Pretest of Speaking Accuracy…….……83

4.3 Investigating the Research Question……..85

4.4 Testing Assumptions……..87

4.5 Criterion Referenced Validity……88

4.6 Reliability Indices……..……...89

4.6.1 Inter-rater Reliability of the Writing Section of PET…….……..89

4.6.2 Inter-rater Reliability of the Speaking Section of PET……..……...90

4.6.3 Inter-rater Reliability of the Speaking Accuracy Pretest…….…..……91

4.6.4 Inter-rater Reliability of the Speaking Accuracy Posttest……..……..91

4.6.5 K-R21Reliability…….....……92

4.7 Discussion……..……..……92

Chapter Five: Conclusion and Implications…….……96

5.1 Restatement of the Problem…….....97

5.2 Procedure……..…….……98

5.3 Data analysis……...……..100

5.4 Summary of findings…….……101

5.5 Pedagogical Implications……..…….……..102

5.5.1 Implications for Language Teaching……...102

5.5.2 Implications for Language Testing……..104

5.5.3 Implications for Material Development……...104

5.6 Limitations of the Study…….……...105

5.7 Suggestions for Further Research……..……...106

5.8 Concluding Remarks…….……108

References……..109-117

Appendices……118-173

List of Tables

1. Table 3.1 Micro- and macro-functions of code switching in the classrooms, developed based on (Canagarajah, 1995, pp. 179-192). ……...……..75

2. Table 3.2 Procedure of the study…….....77

3. Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics of PET pilot study…….80

4. Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics of subject selection……...81

5. Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics PET by Groups…….81

6. Table 4.4 Independent t-test PET by Groups……..82

7. Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics Pretest of Speaking by Groups…….83

8. Table 4.6 Independent t-test Pretest of Speaking Accuracy by Groups……..84

9. Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics Posttest of Speaking Accuracy by Groups……85

10. Table 4.8 Independent t-test Posttest of Speaking Accuracy by Groups……...86

11. Table 4.9 Normality Tests……...88

12. Table 4.10 Criterion Referenced Validity……..89

13. Table 4.11 Inter-Rater Reliability of the Writing test……90

14. Table 4.12 Intra-Rater Reliability of the Speaking Test of PET……90

15. Table 4.13 Intra-Rater Reliability of the Pretest of Speaking Accuracy……91

16. Table 4.14 Intra-Rater Reliability of the Posttest of Speaking Accuracy……..92

17. Table 4.15 K-R21 Reliability Indices…….92

List of Figures

1. Figure 2.1. The types of code-switching and the degree of code-switching in them (Poplack 1980) …….37

2. Figure 4.1 PET by Groups……..83

3. Figure 4.2 Pretest of Speaking Accuracy by Groups……..85

4. Figure 4. 3 Posttest of Speaking Accuracy by Groups……87

List of Abbreviations

CAA	Conversation Analytic Approach
CC	Control Group
CS	Code-Switching
EFL	English for Foreign Language
EG	Experimental Group
FLA	Foreign Language Acquisition
FLL	Foreign Language Learning
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
PET	Preliminary English Test
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SLL	Second Language Learning

List of Appendices

Appendix A Item Analysis Pilot PET

Appendix B Preliminary English Test (PET)

Appendix C Speaking Scale ETS 2007

Appendix D Classroom Corpus

Abstract

The present study was an attempt to investigate the effect of code-switching on intermediate EFL learners' speaking accuracy. To do so, a control group experimental design was proposed in which 60 homogeneous intermediate female students with the age range 18 to 25 in a language school in Tehran took part. The selected participants were divided into two groups; one experimental group (EG) and one control group (CG) with 30 students in each, consisting of 12 to 18 students in each class. The speaking section of the PET was administered and speaking accuracy of the participants was checked through employing ETS speaking scale (2007). To score the learners' performance the inter-rater method was employed. Both experimental and control groups received the same materials, and the same teacher (the researcher herself). The class hours, physical conditions, and other things were the same and the only difference lied in the fact that the experimental group were exposed to different forms of code-switching such as inter-sentential switching, intra-sentential switching occurs, and tag-switching as proposed by Canagarajah (1995), while the control groups were not allowed to use code-switching at all. Following the treatment phase the posttest of speaking accuracy was administered to the students of both experimental and control groups. The data were analyzed employing independent t-test and the results indicated that using code-switching strategies in the EFL classroom significantly affected intermediate learners' speaking accuracy. The reason is that the experimental group learners who were exposed to code-switching strategies outperformed the control group on the posttest of speaking. The results of the study have implications for EFL teachers, language teaching, language testing, and materials developers in the Iranian context.

Keywords: Code-switching, Intermediate EFL Learners, Speaking Accuracy, Iranian Learners

Chapter I

Background and Purpose

Language classrooms are interactive by nature. Although interaction is usually part of every kind of education, in foreign language classrooms it has a particularly significant role. Edmonson (2004) introduces two ways in which communication and acquisition of the language are related. Firstly, the acquisition of the target language aims at developing the ability to communicate with it. Secondly, communication is not only the target but also the means of acquisition. In other words, communication facilitates acquisitional processes which then enable communication in the foreign language. In foreign language classrooms the language to be learned is both the target and the means of instruction. However, in addition to the target language usually there is another language present in the language classroom as well, which is usually the native language of the learners and the teacher. Because two languages exist in the classroom, it leads to a situation in which codes are switched. Thus, *code-switching* is usually a natural part of language classroom interaction because the context is bilingual.

1.1 Background

According to Greggio and Gil (2007), code-switching in the area of second /foreign language acquisition / learning (SLA/FLA/SLL/FLL) was first seen as a linguistic behavior of developing bilinguals in bilingual or multilingual settings. Early studies on this issue were carried out in bilingual contexts in the United States, with the objective of investigating primarily the functions of

code- switching in the speech of bilingual teachers. (Martin-Jones, 1995 as cited in Greggio & Gil, 2007). In the mid 1990's, researchers started focusing on the way code-switching may contribute to the interactional work that teachers and learners do in bilingual classrooms. Since then researchers have examined several issues related to teachers 'and learners' use of code-switching in bilingual or multilingual educational contexts around the world (Greggio & Gil, 2007).

What role, if any, should the students' mother tongue play in the language classroom? What is the language classroom? Meyer (2008) discusses these questions; he believes that, the language classroom is not one classroom, but many, encompassing both second and foreign language instruction, as well as a variety of levels from novice to near native proficiency. Given this, there are a variety of answers to just how much of a role the students' mother tongue should play.

When students come from various countries with various mother tongues and they are studying an official language of the country they immigrated to, employing their L1 in the language classroom is difficult, though not impossible, if there are at least two people in the class that speak the same language. On the other hand, the use of the students' L1 becomes a far more practical issue when dealing with linguistically homogeneous classrooms, which is the situation we deal with in foreign language classrooms in Iran.

However, even in the case of linguistically homogeneous classes, there is still controversy over L1 use. Students need exposure to the L2. In many cases the only exposure the students may get is in the classroom; therefore, shouldn't the instructor speak only the L2? Meyer (2008) suggests that it depends on the nature of the classroom. Is it a class full of novice learners of the L2? Is it a class of students preparing for a stay abroad? Is it a class of students training to become translators/interpreters? (Meyer, 2008) To make it clear Meyer believes that the amount of L1 use and how it is employed should vary with classroom environment. He argues that the L1 provides scaffolding that should be gradually dismantled as the students' progress. Not enough and affective filters may be raised, too much and progress is slowed. The L2 should be used as much as possible. Maximizing L2 use should be the goal in every classroom.

In another study, Arnfast and Jorgensen (2003) argue that in the literature, code-switching is treated remarkably differently depending on who switches codes. Speakers described as second language learners are generally said to use code-switches to make up for deficiencies in their command of the L2, and as a learning strategy code-switching is considered unproductive. In contrast to this, code-switching among speakers described as bilinguals is treated as a competence, even an advanced competence, which allows the speakers to negotiate their social relations in finely-tuned detail. They claim that among learners code-switching is not just a strategy used at a lower proficiency

level and it may develop into a bilingual competence in advanced learners (Arnfast & Jorgensen, 2003).

To make it clear, while some teachers see code-switching as a matter of concern and a sign of deficiency in their students, some recent studies suggest that code-switching plays a major part in the acquisition of a second language and its use might be an important competence when used correctly by speakers of several languages (Halmari, 2004 as cited in Jakobsson & Rydén, 2010)

There has not been that much research on code-switching in EFL classrooms, because many researchers do not regard language switching in that context as genuine code-switching. Code-switching in foreign language classrooms has been regarded as the result of inadequate competence in the foreign language. However, some researchers, e.g. Edmonson (2004) treat code-switching in the classroom as a 'special case of code-switching'. In any case, previous research (e.g. Soderberg, Arnfast & Jorgensen, 2003) has shown that even at beginner levels of language learning there are more functions to code-switching than those caused by lack of language skills. These conflicting ideas motivates the investigation of the when and why of code-switching.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The use of L1 in L2 classes has always been controversial because different theories of L2 acquisition offer different hypotheses about the value of L1 use

in L2 classes (Mahmoudi, 2011). Although some researches have been conducted regarding the Iranian L2 teaching and learning, (Maghsoudi, 2008; Mirhasani & Jafarpour-Mamaghani, 2009; Momenian & Ghafar-Samar, 2011), most of these researches are not applied in a bilingual school setting, as the majority of schools in Iran are monolingual. Some theorists have advocated a monolingual approach, believing in the identical process of L2 and L1 learning, and arguing that maximum exposure to L2 and least exposure to L1 are very essential because interference from L1 knowledge obstructs L2 learning process (Cook, 2001; Krashen, 1981). On the other hand, some have argued against the complete elimination of L1 from L2 classes (e.g., Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Nation, 2003) and have reiterated that a judicious and well-planned use of L1 can yield positive results (Cook, 2001).

Macaro (1997) summarized the attitudes toward teacher CS of first language in language classrooms in three words: virtually all, maximal all, and optimal. The virtually all view is the view that the learners' first language has no value in the class and should be avoided by all means; the maximal view rules out the role of L1 in foreign language classrooms, although its position is not as extreme as the position taken by the advocates of the virtually all view; the optimal view perspective holds the use of L1 has pedagogical value and should be emphasized.

The first two views are based on questions related to whether the process of learning L2 is similar to that of L1. If learning L2 takes the same path taken in the acquisition of L1, then there is ample justification for the exclusion of L1 in language classes; In other words these views advocate the exclusion of L1 in the L2 classrooms. (Abdollahi, Rahmany, Maleki, 2015)

Macaro (2001) argues that there has been considerable debate about monolingual foreign language classrooms recently. Some researchers feel that only the target language (L2) should be used as medium of instruction while others argue that the use of mother tongue is an important tool in foreign language learning (Macaro, 2001). Macaro (2001) goes on presenting that no study has yet demonstrated that the exclusion of L1 improves L2 learning. Through teacher training courses, it is emphasized that language choice in the classroom should be well-thought beforehand and the use of the target and native languages should be logical and conscious. Meanwhile, the classroom environment is dynamic and it is impossible to plan and predict everything beforehand. Nowadays, in Iran the teacher trainees are encouraged to use as much of the target language as possible. However, the mother tongue also has its place in the classroom.

Accorging to Abdollahi, Rahmani, and Maleki (2015), there are some views that support the role of CS in L2 classes. The three theoretical accounts