

To switch or not to switch: Examining the code-switching practices of teachers of French as a foreign language

MARGARET GEARON
MONASH UNIVERSITY

In classes where French is taught as a foreign/second language in Victorian secondary schools, a study of native and non-native speaking teachers' classroom discourse shows a preponderance of the use of English as the unmarked language. The second language, French, is used as the marked language, that is, it is rarely used purposefully, to communicate an authentic message; this, in spite of the recognised value of comprehensible input and immersion situations for successful second language learning/acquisition. However, the performance of students at the final oral examination tends to belie any adverse effects of such an approach. This study examines the code-switching practices of six teachers of French as a foreign language and attempts to describe what is actually happening in an average lesson in a Victorian secondary school classroom. It considers the development of a model for analysing the data in the light of the large amount of teacher monologue and seeks to develop an understanding of how the code-switching occurs.

1. Introduction

In this paper, I am going to describe a study of the code-switching practices of six teachers of French as a second language, four of whom are non-native speakers of French and two native speakers, all teachers in Victorian secondary schools. The purpose of the study was to examine instances of code-switching between English and French in the classroom oral discourse of the teachers in order to determine where and how these occurred.

Code-switching refers to "the alternating use of two languages either within a sentence or between sentences" (Clyne 1987:740). Where a single French item is incorporated into the teacher's English utterance, this will be considered as an instance of lexical transference (see Clyne 1987:740-741 for a discussion of the terms used to refer to code-switching) or as an embedded constituent (see Myers-Scotton 1992).

In order to have a basis from which I could categorise the code-switches, a review of the literature on code-switching in social interactions was undertaken, leading to a decision to investigate the extent to which Myers-Scotton's (1992) theory of marked and unmarked languages (Myers-Scotton 1993) applied to second

language teachers' classroom oral discourse. According to Myers-Scotton (1993:75) an unmarked language is the expected or safe choice, whereas the marked language is the unexpected choice. It may be anticipated that the unmarked language of the interactions in a second language classroom would be in the target language, since research into optimal conditions for language acquisition shows the importance of comprehensible input (Krashen 1982), of a linguistically rich environment, and of opportunities for comprehensible output (Swain 1985; Ellis 1990). This, however, does not appear to be the case in the second language classrooms observed in this study, where English, the language of instruction in other secondary school curriculum areas, predominates as the unmarked language in French classes, with the exception of one teacher (Teacher F). It would appear that the traditional view of a second language as the object of instruction rather than as a means for communication determines the use of French in these teachers' oral discourse and results in it being the marked language.

2. The data base

To obtain the data for this study, I contacted former colleagues and arranged to audio or video record lessons at times suitable to them. I explained that I was interested in their communicative teaching techniques, but did not mention that I was most interested in their use of the

target language with their students. I was able to collect data from a range of secondary school classes, from second to fifth year of study of French. In School A, I was fortunate to be able to follow the same group of students and their teacher over three years. As well as observing and recording lessons, I interviewed each teacher and asked them to complete a questionnaire; I also interviewed Teachers A, B, D and E as a group and transcribed the discussion which occurred. Comments the teachers made during the interviews about their code-switching practices were later compared to their actual use of French and English in the recorded data.

The lessons and interviews were transcribed using an adaptation of the system proposed by Dubois *et al.* (1988) which uses intonation units to establish the boundaries, a feature which assists in the determination of inter- and intra-sentential code-switches. In order to distinguish between the two languages and determine their relationship to each other, the teachers' use of French was transcribed in bold and italics and their use of English in plain font, while for students, the use of French was transcribed in italics.

3. Data analysis

Myers-Scotton's model of matrix language (ML) - "the language which sets the morphosyntactic frame for codeswitching utterances" (Myers-Scotton 1992:19) and embedded language (EL) perhaps suits the data better than the markedness model (see Section 4 below). According to Myers-Scotton (1992:22) "The ML in any CS¹ utterance is the language of more morphemes in the type of discourse where the conversation in question occurs, if cultural borrowings for new objects or concepts are excluded from the morpheme count". In the study reported here, for five of the six teachers, the matrix language is English, whereas French is the embedded language consisting of single items (embedded language constituents) or of longer utterances (embedded language islands).

In the following examples of embedded language constituents, some of the features indicated by the teachers themselves as characteristic of their common use of the target language can be seen, namely the expression of numbers in French.

Teacher D Year 9, June 1994

T: Alors (So)

VOUS AVEZ (you have)

quickly please

get your sheet

worksheets

and that's page *quarante-trois*. (and that's page forty-three)

And the big number on the

top of the sheet is *trente-quatre*. (thirty-four)

The next three examples illustrate the concept of embedded language constituents where these occur for pedagogical reasons in these teachers' oral discourse (see Discussion section v in this paper).

Teacher A Year 9A February 1993

T: I'm going to say the first ten *en français*. (I'm going to say the first ten in French.)

[...]

Put *j'aime* in there. (Put "I like" in there.)

But it's not tailored like *la veste*. (It's not tailored like the blazer/jacket.)

Teacher E Year 9, May 1993

T: These kind of *chaussures* are *des baskets*. (These kind of shoes are runners/sneakers)

[...]

I could say *une chemise* and get out of it. (I could say "a shirt" and get out of it.)

Teacher F Year 10 June 1994

T: *Le bus* (The bus)

oui. (yes)

Quelle est la différence? (What's the difference?)

Le car (The coach)

c'est long distance (is long distance)

((GESTURES WITH HANDS))

et le bus (and the bus)

c'est ~~~? (is ...?)

The above examples conform to Myers-Scotton's characterisation of matrix language and embedded language constituents and islands as they show evidence of "internal structural dependency relations" (Myers-Scotton 1992:23) and are well-formed, according to the grammatical constraints of the respective languages,

English (ML) and French (EL) for Teachers A & E, and the reverse for Teacher F. These examples also conform to the phonological rules of each language. Given that word order for the standard variety of the two languages in each of the above examples is identical, it is easy to effect a code-switch at these places in the utterances without breaking any law of grammatical constraints.

4. The notion of marked and unmarked languages

Using Myers-Scotton's (1993) notions of marked and unmarked languages in the social interactions of bilinguals, I also searched the data for times when the target language (French) was the unmarked language, rather than English, the language of the other curriculum areas and of non-classroom interactions between students and teachers.

With one exception, Teacher F, one of the two native speakers, the unmarked language is English and the marked language French. An examination of the data showed that this is particularly apparent where all six teachers show their firm commitment to the view that communication in a second language develops through knowledge of its linguistic features, where a focus on the formal properties of the language precedes the learners' ability to interact meaningfully and purposefully in the target language (French). The following examples from the data demonstrate this claim:

Teacher A Year 9A February 1993

T: Is there anyone in the room who had *vingt sur vingt*? (Is there anyone in the room who had twenty out of twenty?)

[...]

And the *masculin est*? (And the masculine is?)

[...]

But *le contraire de long* (But the opposite of long)

qu'est-ce que ça veut dire? (what does that mean?)

Teacher D Year 9, June 1994

T: Girls

I'm just going to give the others their paper to start and then we'll get going.

You can all *ouvrez vos livres à la page* (you can all open your books at page)

à la page soixante-et-un (at page sixty-one)

et ouvrez vos feuilles à la page quarante-deux (and open your sheets at page forty-two)

Soixante-et-un and *quarante-deux* is what we need. (Sixty-one and forty-two is what we need)

Teacher E Year 10, May 1994

T: Yes you could

um while Ch is doing this

trouvez votre Hexagone s'il vous plaît (Find your Hexagone please)

Prenez un stylo (Take out a pen)

Il est neuf heures et quart (It's a quarter past nine)

<X words X> written yet?

In the examples from Teachers D and E, there is also some question of whether or not the syntax in the initial French utterance conforms to the equivalence constraint (Poplack and Sankoff 1981; Clyne 1987; Myers-Scotton 1992). The English modal form is usually followed by the infinitive, as is the French, but in the above extracts, both appear to be followed by the imperative (*trouvez, prenez, ouvrez*). In the case of *trouvez*, it is possible to confuse the forms as the phonology of the morpheme is the same as the infinitive. I have assumed that the teacher intended to use the imperative because the following verb is in that form.

Teacher F, on the other hand, tends to use the target language, French, as the unmarked one in her lessons, even though the focus is also on the formal properties of the language. When she switches languages, this is usually what Myers-Scotton has termed embedded language islands, that is, the whole of the code-switched segment conforms to the phonology and morphosyntax of the embedded language and does not use those of the matrix language. The extract below provides an example of this:

Teacher F Year 10, June 1994

T: *Oui* (Yes)

vous avez oublié (you've forgotten)

forgotten

Quoi? (What?)

C'est tout? (Is that all?)

[...]

Bon. (Good.)

Okay. (Okay.)

Before you write this down

comment comment on dit en français (how how do you say in French)

by the with the metro

or by the metro?

In this example, the first code-switch conforms to one of Gumperz' (1982) functions of code-switching, that of reiterating a message and is confirmed by the teacher's explanation that the switch occurred because she uses this type of repetition in the two languages to ensure understanding of lexical items. The second and third switches have more of a pedagogical function where the teacher is using translation to revise students' knowledge of lexical items. She switches between French and English to begin an instruction, then back to French to seek an oral equivalent to the prepositional phrases. This appears to be a common use of English in the lessons observed: when students are going to write, instructions are given in English (for Teacher F, the second language) but where oral exercises/activities are concerned, these are in French (her first language).

In Victoria, the stated goal of classroom instructed L2 teaching is to enable the learners to use language for personal, social and informational purposes (LOTE CSF 1995:15). Included among the objectives are the use of language to "interact with others in socially and culturally appropriate ways and to understand, establish and maintain social relationships" (LOTE CSF 1995:9); developing knowledge of formal properties is not mentioned in the document as a necessary pre-cursor to such uses of the second language.

The participating teachers in the study are very aware of such goals, as the latter are similar to those espoused by the Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE) Study Design, the syllabus outline for the final two years of secondary schooling, introduced in 1990. The means whereby these teachers develop such abilities in their learners differs, however, depending on the year level. For example, Teachers A, B, and D, in the Year 11 lessons recorded, used the target language as both the unmarked and marked language, as demonstrated in the following examples:

Teacher D, Year 11, November 1992

T: Okay. (Okay.)

La dernière page. (The last page.)

Je pense que c'est la dernière page. (I think it's the last page.)

Oui. (Yes.)

Dans ma maison. (In my house.)

Dans ma maison est un poème difficile. (In my house is a difficult poem.)

Donc il faut bien écouter. (So you have to listen carefully.)

((READS POEM ALOUD))

Un poème bizarre (A strange poem)

inattendu (unexpected)

et différent des autres. (and different from the others.)

Assez différent de ceux qu'on a vus. (Rather different from those we've seen.)

D'abord (First of all)

pour vous aider (to help you)

on va voir les similarités avec d'autres poèmes. (we will look at the similarities with other poems.)

On a la similarité du rouge. (We have the similarity with red.)

Nous avons déjà rencontré souvent la couleur rouge. (We have already often encountered the colour red.)

SZ: <X many words X>

T: Oui oui (Yes yes)

Je vais expliquer (I'm going to explain)

je vais expliquer (I'm going to explain.)

I would like first of all to draw to things

you must realise we had before

then it will be easier to look at what's different.

Donc (So)

la couleur rouge (the colour red)

le contraste entre rouge et blanc. (the contrast between red and white.)

And we've had that too.

Myers-Scotton (1988) explains the choice of one language as marked and unmarked during conventionalised exchanges as dependent upon the particular speech event where "the rights and obligations balance[...] is derived from whatever situational features are salient to the exchange, such as status of participants, topic etc" (Myers-Scotton 1988:153). These factors apply to the second language classroom teaching situation where students at Year 11 (usually the fifth year of L2 study in a secondary school) are expected to be able to participate in classroom oral discussions on certain topics more easily than beginning students (Year 8 or 9). This expectation may explain the differences in the code-switching practices of the teachers in this study. They may consider it more suitable to use French as the unmarked language with experienced learners with

whom they have had longer to establish a relationship of confidence and trust (as expressed by four of these teachers during the group interview) than with more junior students.

Another feature of the teachers' code-switching practices concerns the model that they are providing for learners through these practices. It would appear that students are limited in the development of their interlanguage by being restricted in what they can produce spontaneously in the L2. The teachers encourage full native-like forms in student responses and reinforce this by the feedback which they provide. Students prepare their role plays in advance and these are checked for accuracy and appropriateness prior to being performed. On the other hand, students rarely get to interact spontaneously in the target language with the teacher or each other, as the majority of classes are based on a traditional teacher-centred format where the exchanges are formalised by the routine described by Sindlar *et al.* (1972) that is:

teacher elicits-student responds-teacher gives feedback.

The code-switching which teachers engage in is related to the conventions required by such an approach more than those which might occur during social interactions; that is, they are pedagogical rather than sociolinguistic and do not really provide input which students could take and convert to output.

Myers-Scotton, McConwell and Poplack (1988) suggest that switching itself may form the unmarked choice for certain exchanges. The data from the group of teachers in this study supports such a claim as the use of the two codes as the unmarked choice, English to move the lesson along and French as the object of the lesson, would help to explain some switches in certain instances.

Myers-Scotton (1993) claims that it is the speaker's choice rather than the situational factors which determines whether or not a code-switch will occur. This would appear not to be the case for the teachers in this study, who explained at interview that their choice of language for lengthy, complex organisational instructions and explanations was driven by the physical and temporal constraints of their teaching context (situational factors). They used English because it was faster and more efficient and where they determined uncertainty and lack of understanding from students' facial expressions, and French when they were sure that students would

understand, or to reinforce expressions which had just been introduced (for example, page numbers, common/brief instructions, some classroom commands). This extract from Teacher F, writing comments on the transcription of one of her lessons, provides an example of these claims:

"They could not see the point, so I thought it was quicker in English.

Mélange des deux pour avoir des réponses plus rapidement.

Grammatical explanations are quicker and better understood in English.

Instructions in English to go/progress quicker."

Teacher E provided the following comments, also supported by others, during the group interview:-

"I always use page numbers for what we're turning to [...]

but once we've done that really we go very much into English for things [...]"

5. Constraints on code-switching

It is generally agreed that a code-switch should not occur between a bound morpheme and a phonologically unintegrated lexical item or morpheme. However, there are some instances in the data where this constraint is not adhered to. These examples from Teacher A's data illustrate a lack of conformity to the morpheme order principle (Myers-Scotton 1992:24) at a morphophonological level.

Teacher A Year 8A February 1992

T: I told you about the *éclair*'s

Year 9 February 1993

T: Here we've got one of our *grande*'s being used.

Year 10 March 1994

T: Get the *ne* 's and *pas* ' in the right place

These examples show this teacher's use of target language phonology with English morphology which comes from constantly using English as the unmarked/matrix language and embedding target language items into its structure.

The next examples from this teacher's data contravene Myers-Scotton's statement that "the only way an 'active' EL system morpheme may occur in a codeswitching utterance is in an EL island" (Myers-Scotton 1992:28).

Teacher A Year 10 March 1994

T:[...]

But I had to stop there anyway
because uh

to dit bonjour à Mademoiselle V (to say hello to Miss V)

Year 10 July 1994

T:[...]

how she hadn't vendre la voiture. (how she hadn't sold the car)

In the first example, we would expect to hear the infinitive form, *dire*, which would follow more logically from the English 'to'. In the second one, we would expect to hear *vendu*, the past participle, as this would conform to the past tense structure in French where the auxiliary verb (to have/*avoir*) is accompanied by the past participle of the action verb (in this case of *vendre*, therefore *vendu*). It is possible that there may have been interference caused by the teacher glancing down at the written word in the exercise book where the cues were provided in the infinitive form at the same time as she was formulating the utterance orally.

6. Code-switching as a pedagogical phenomenon

The literature on code-switching refers to it as a linguistic, sociolinguistic or psycholinguistic phenomenon. I would like to suggest that in Australian classrooms, where the focus is on the language as object of instruction more than as a vehicle for communication, the code-switching which occurs is pedagogical in nature; that is, the teachers code-switch to the target language as a teaching strategy. This is clearly exemplified in Teachers A, C and F's treatment of the perfect tense (*passé composé*) and in Teacher F's revision of modes of transport and of prepositions. The following examples are provided in support of this claim:-

Teacher A Year 10 June 1994

T: [...]

Am?

Have you got a past tense there

you might be able to <X>?

Sam: J'ai sauvé la vie à tout le monde. (I saved everyone's life.)

T: Good

J'ai sauvé la vie à tout le monde. (I saved everyone's life.)

And there's another one there too.

It's written in the book.

((SJS RAISES HAND. T IS NOT LOOKING IN HER DIRECTION))

T: He?

She: <X words X>

T: What did she do?

What did he do?

Qu'est-ce qu'il a ~ (What did he)

She: <X>

T: He fought

alright?

struggled with

fought with un animal sauvage. (fought with a wild animal.)

In the above extract, the elicitation of the grammatical feature is conducted in English, French being used to reinforce a student's appropriate response from the textbook. French is also used to elicit an English equivalent of an utterance containing the structure under consideration, although this is one area where there is a lack of consistency (see Section 7.1 below). These switches are all pedagogical in nature; that is, French occurs as the marked language to exemplify the specific target language linguistic feature/s being taught through English, the unmarked language, which is used to convey information and to prompt responses from students.

The next example provides another approach to the teaching of the perfect tense:

Teacher C Year 9, March 1994

T: [...]

Let's hear his story.

<X words X> how he decided to]get to work

and each little story will end up with more and more

<X> in it that you have to provide the answers for.

SZ: <X>?

T: à la page vingt Z. (on page twenty)

((READS ALOUD))

Lundi dernier (Last Monday)

Jacques Malchance est allé au bureau à pied (James Unlucky walked to the office)

est allé au bureau à pied. (walked to the office.)

Qu'est-ce que ça veut dire? (What does that mean?)

Jacques Malchance est allé au bureau à pied. ("James Unlucky went to the office on foot.")

SZ?

SZ: On foot

he went

T: on foot.

He went to the office on foot.

[...]

Now let's look at the next one

jeudi (Thursday)

let's find out what happened on *jeudi* (let's find out what happened on Thursday)

Thursday

jeudi il ~ ~ (On Thursday he ~ ~)

In this extract, English is also the unmarked language, setting the scene for an exercise where the students read the French utterances after the teacher had modelled these. Again the marked language, French, is used to exemplify a specific language structure which is being taught via translation of each segment of the story. The unmarked language, English, is both to convey meaning and to move the pedagogical process along.

Pedagogical features of code-switching are those which occur where the focus is on knowledge of the formal properties of the L2 as a pre-requisite to being able to interact purposefully and meaningfully in everyday social and informational interactions. This focus influences the choice of marked/unmarked and matrix/embedded languages.

Merritt et al. (1992:118) found that teachers' code-switching was most often "motivated by cognitive and classroom management factors involving a need either to focus or regain students' attention or to clarify, enhance or reinforce lesson material". They found four types of code-switching in their research into teachers' classroom practices, ranging from a reformulation across codes which contained no new information or instructions to translation or word substitution within a sentence which seemed to be a technique for teaching or reinforcing the

meaning of the L2 words (Merritt et al. 1992:114-6).

They also point out that students learn to cope with teachers' code-switching as they do with the other modalities, verbal and non-verbal, which are used and they note the need for consistency in teachers' patterns of language use in order for appropriate communication to occur (Merritt et al. 1992:109-110).

7. Discussion

A brief summary of the teachers' use of the two languages, their code-switching practices and their use of lexical transfer, is difficult given the large variety of these, but some features are striking and these will be presented below:-

i) the inconsistent and rather idiosyncratic use of the target language (French) by five of the six teachers as exemplified here:

Teacher A Year 9B, February 1993

T: Girls

I <X wordsX> *pas d'anglais!* (<X words X> no English!)

Pas d'anglais! (No English!)

Ça c'est le sac à main. (That's a handbag)

Sac à main (Handbag)

sac à main. (handbag)

Est-ce qu'il y a des problèmes avec le sac à main? (Are there any problems with the handbag?)

Un petit dessin (A small drawing)

un petit dessin. (a small drawing.)

Teacher A Year 9A, February 1993

T: Beg your pardon.

That's alright.

Overcoat's fine for *le manteau*

but *l'imperméable* for the raincoat.

Okay.

Next one.

Tu t'appelles comment? (What's your name?)

Excusez-moi mademoiselle. (Excuse me miss)

Tu t'appelles comment? (What's your name?)

Both of the above extracts represent this teacher's inconsistent and idiosyncratic use of the target language. In the first, in spite of her own frequent use of English to

explain the meaning of lexical items, she reproves the students for doing so, remonstrating with them in the target language, while in the second, she resorts to the target language to identify a particular student, this time not using the marked language for pedagogical purposes but for an authentic social one.

Sometimes students are prompted to supply an English equivalent by a target language question, and sometimes by the same question in English as occurred in the example below:

Teacher A Year 10, June 1994

T: [...]

What's the whole question mean?

((GESTURES BROADLY WITH HAND, LOOKING AT SLA))

Qu'est-ce que tu as fait pendant le weekend? (What did you do during the weekend?)

[...]

What?

Qu'est-ce que ça veut dire (What does it/that mean?)

<Q J'ai lutté contre un animal sauvage Q>? (struggled with a wild animal?)

Both Teachers A and C use the same target language question (*Qu'est-ce que ça veut dire?*) to elicit an English equivalent to a French utterance containing an example of the structure being taught.

ii) the use of English as the main code, particularly in conveying messages about the formal properties of the target language

Examples from the data are presented below:

Teacher C Year 9, May 1994.

T: *Je n'ai plus de bananes.* (I don't have any more bananas.)

What are you say ~ ~

what are you writing as your verb?

Can you tell me what your verb is in that sentence?

SMar: <X>

T: Non (No)

the verb

Teacher F Year 10, June 1994

T: [...]

Euh which tense is that?

Elle est arrivée (She arrived)

Euh

elle a traversé (She crossed)

elle n'a pas pu (She couldn't)

Which tense is it?

SZ: Perfect

T: Yeah

perfect.

In French

le ~ ~ ? (the ~ ~ ?)

iii) the use of English in communicating important information about classroom procedures

Teacher D Year 9, May 1994

T: <X words X>

I'll just quickly take the roll

If you could just say *présente* (If you could just say present)

quickly when I call your name

or *oui* if you can't say *présente*. (or Yes if you can't say present)

But I think you can all *présente* (But I think you can all present)

I'm sure

The above extracts show some of the ways in which the code-switching practices of four of the teachers operated in this study. Teacher A most frequently switched from English to French to provide the students with lexical items, although occasionally, she continued from a single item to using French as the unmarked language. Teachers C, D and E's code-switches from English to French corresponded to their providing an example of a particular grammatical structure and/or lexical items which students had to learn, as well as when communicating information and/or giving instructions to students. In the above examples, Teachers D's instructions show the target language as an embedded constituent and an intra-sentential switch. This is not to claim that the teachers always used the target language in this way, indeed all four teachers (A, C, D and E) show a variety of code-switching practices including some lexical transfer.

iv) English as the unmarked language

Teachers see their use of English as having a sociolinguistic function of "getting the kids on side" (Teachers A and E 1994 interview), of gaining the trust and confidence of the students, establishing a personal relationship and rapport with them, and allowing them to feel comfortable to communicate with the teacher outside of the (L2) French classroom. Teachers A, B, C and E (all non-native speakers, commenting during the group interview) believe that this cannot be achieved by using the L2, French, as the main medium of communication at all times.

v) code-switching as a pedagogical phenomenon

With few exceptions, the occurrence of embedded L2 constituents and embedded islands throughout the data tends to correspond with each participant in the study teaching a lexical item or illustrating a grammatical aspect of the target language. The teachers' responses at interview indicate that they do not seem to be conscious of how they are using the two languages, even after being asked to read and comment on a transcription of at least one of their lessons. It may be assumed, then, that they are comfortable using the target language for pedagogical purposes, that is, to teach it specifically and to reinforce language the students have previously encountered (numbers, identifying oneself, classroom commands). In addition, they occasionally use it for social purposes - to communicate greetings or leave takings - and as fillers or to mark opening and closing moves (use of *bon, alors, okay*).

The target language, French, therefore takes on a role similar to that of other curriculum areas, that is, it is chiefly a body of content to be taught and learned, rather than a means of communicating content and knowledge through a different code. Code-switching, in this instance, although a feature of the teachers' bilingual competence, is seen by them more as a quicker, more effective means of conveying the necessary information about this body of knowledge which constitutes the French language and culture. All six teachers declare that they bring to their classes their own learned knowledge of the language and culture more than they do their bilingual competence, which they see as implicit and acquired.

8. Conclusion

Locating the code-switches and classifying them as inter- or intra-sentential in the classroom oral discourse of the six teachers in the study was completed in order to describe what was happening in the lessons observed and recorded. This led to a consideration of which language was the matrix and which the embedded one, and also to determining which could be termed the unmarked and which the marked language.

The analysis of the classroom data has shown that these teachers' oral discourse contains a high proportion of code-switched utterances from the unmarked language, English, to the marked language, French, the target language of instruction. In terms of comprehensible input, there are very few occurrences of extended segments of discourse in the target language which provide for authentic input. Instead, students are only provided with fully formed native language forms which they are expected to reproduce without going through a period of interlanguage development.

The teachers do not seem to be using their bilingual competence in a way which indicates that they are aware of code-switching as a linguistic and pedagogical phenomenon. Consequently, it is recommended that teacher training courses address the issue of code-switching and assist teachers to develop effective practices in their use of the two languages, particularly ones which can be related more closely to learners' communicative needs. Courses also need to develop teachers' awareness of the effect of code-switching on L2 acquisition in formal classroom instructed settings.

References

- Byron, E. 1996. *The LOTE Curriculum Standards Framework in action*. Unpublished manuscript. Victoria: Board of Studies and Victorian School of Languages.
- Clyne, M. 1972. Perception of code-switching by bilinguals: an experiment. *ITL*, 16:45-48.
- Clyne, M. 1987. Constraints on code-switching - how universal are they? *Linguistics*, 25: 739-764.
- Clyne, M. 1991. *Community languages - the Australian experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, M., Jenkins, C., Chen, I., Tsokalidou, R. and T. Wallner 1995. *Developing second language from primary school*. Canberra: The National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia.

- Curriculum Standards Framework: Languages Other Than English. 1995. Melbourne: Board of Studies.
- DuBois, J., Cumming, S. and S. Schuetze-Coburn 1988. *Discourse transcriptions*. Mimeograph. Santa Barbara: University of California.
- Eastman, C. (ed.) 1992. *Codeswitching*. Clevedon, Avon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Heller, M. (ed.) 1988. *Code-switching: anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Merritt, M., Cleghorn, A., Obagi, J. and G. Bunyi 1992. Socialising multilingualism: determinants of codeswitching in Kenyan primary classrooms. In C. Eastman (ed.), 103-121.
- McConvell, P. 1988. MIX-IM-UP: Aboriginal code-switching, old and new. In M. Heller (ed.), 97-149.
- Milroy, L. and P. Muysken (eds.) 1995. *One speaker, two languages: cross disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1983a. Comment: markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 39:119-128.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1983b. The negotiation of identities in conversation: a theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 44:115-136.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1988. Code switching as indexical of social negotiations. In M. Heller (ed.), 151-186.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1992. Comparing Codeswitching and Borrowing. In C. Eastman (ed.), 19-40.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993a. *Social motivations for code-switching: evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993b. *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1995. A lexically based model of code-switching. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), 233-256.
- Poplack, S. 1988. Contrasting Patterns of Code-Switching in Two Communities. In M. Heller (ed.), 215-244.
- Sankoff, D. and S. Poplack 1981. A formal grammar for code-switching. *Papers in Linguistics*, 14(1): 3-46.
- Sinclair, J., Forsyth, I.J., Coulthard, M. and M.C. Ashby 1972. *The English used by teachers and pupils*. Final Report to S.S.R.C. (Mimeo) United Kingdom: Birmingham University.

Endnotes

- 1 CS is the acronym used by Myers-Scotton to refer to code-switching.

Appendix: Transcription conventions

| | |
|--|---------------|
| long timed pause (over 30 seconds) | ...(n) |
| medium timed pause (up to 30 seconds) | ..(n) |
| short timed pause (up to 3 seconds) | .(n) |
| primary stress | " |
| secondary stress | ' |
| final pitch contour | . |
| rising question contour | ? |
| exclamation | ! |
| truncated intonation unit | ~~ |
| truncated incompleted word or morpheme | - |
| marked unit or word | <MARC X MARC> |
| quotation, incl. teacher reading from textbook | <Q words Q> |
| laugh | @ |
| extended laughter | @= |
| one indecipherable syllable or word | <X> |
| an indecipherable phrase | <XX> |
| an indecipherable sentence or more | <XXX> |
| the speaker is the teacher | T |
| the speaker is one student | S |
| the speaker is whole class or large group | SS |
| unidentified student | SZ |
| unidentified student where more than one student cannot be identified | SX |
| suppressed proper names of people, schools or easily identifiable places | Z |
| unquoted utterances | [...] |

Dr Margaret Gearon is a Senior Lecturer in the Faculty of Education at Monash University, Clayton. Her chief research interests are in teachers' use of the target language in languages other than English (LOTE) classrooms and she has given conference papers on this topic in Paris, Singapore and Sydney. her doctoral thesis concerned the code-switching practices of teachers of French in secondary school classrooms, and since completing this, she has been researching the language of teachers and students in partial immersion programs in addition to continuing her study of teacher's use of the target language in language as object classes. Currently, she is involved in the review and re-writing of curriculum and assessment in second languages from Prep to Year 12.