Teaching in Two Languages: The Pedagogical Value of Code-Switching in Multilingual Classroom Settings

Sithembele Marawu

Introduction

This chapter explores how an English/Xhosa bilingual teacher uses code-switching (CS) as an educational strategy in a South African township school. CS, 'the use of more than one language in the course of a single communication discourse episode' (Heller 1988: 4), is a widespread phenomenon in South African schools, particularly in rural and township schools (Heugh 2000: 19). However, there are views that if two languages 'are used simultaneously, like in code-switching and with notes in both languages, it will create confusion' (Vorster 2008: 38). Nevertheless, CS is a common feature of discourse in multilingual societies—in schools, teachers use it to 'facilitate the learners' access to the curriculum content' (Ndayipfukamiye 1996: 36). Some teachers, therefore, regard CS as a pedagogic resource worth using in classroom situations characterized by linguistic diversity.

S. Marawu (✉)
Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Cape Town, South Africa

© The Author(s) 2018

P. Van Avermaet et al. (eds.), *The Multilingual Edge of Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-54856-6_5

Research Problem

This chapter grapples with the problem of whether learners' diverse linguistic repertoires could be used in classrooms as educational strategies to enhance learning; it specifically looks at CS as a classroom strategy. In South Africa, what exacerbates the problem is perceptions that use of indigenous languages in classrooms is a feature of inferior education, while English is viewed as a language of status, technology and socioeconomic advancement. On the other hand, teachers continue using indigenous languages unofficially for teaching purposes.

Background

While it is argued that children grasp information presented to them in their mother tongue (MT) more quickly than information presented 'through an unfamiliar linguistic medium' (Fasold 1993: 293)—in most former colonial countries, the colonial language 'becomes so naturalized that it is no longer seen as construing a particular ideological line' (Heller and Martin-Jones 2001: 2). In South Africa, for example, some African parents opt for 'English only' education because they see it more 'as a gateway to better education and economic empowerment' (De Wet 2002: 120) than as the perpetuation of colonial hegemony.

During the heydays of British imperialism in South Africa, English was imposed on Africans as an official language and medium of instruction. As Smith once put it, 'You shall all learn to speak English at the schools which I shall establish for you' (Oakes 1988: 133–6). The learners' diverse linguistic repertoires were excluded as pedagogical resources. Furthermore, no proper facilities were provided for the teaching and learning of English in African schools.

When, in 1953, the apartheid regime in South Africa promulgated the notorious Bantu Education system for Africans, it introduced MT instruction. This was not done to embrace linguistic diversity as an educational resource but to deny Africans a better system of education. As Alexander puts it, the 'Afrikaner National Party was using the very sensible UNESCO declarations on the importance of using vernacular languages

as media of instruction in schools in order to justify and beautify its racist curriculum' (Alexander 1999: 5).

The aim of the National Party (NP) was not to develop indigenous languages but to enhance oppression and exploitation through education. This could be one of the reasons why some African parents perceive MT education as reminiscent of the Bantu Education which aimed to relegate South African black people to oppressive menial jobs as 'hewers of wood and drawers of water' (Beukes 1992: 47).

South Africa is a multilingual country and yet English still enjoys a dominant position as a language of learning and teaching (LOLT). In the post-apartheid Constitution (Section 6, Act 108 of 1996) and in language policies, South Africa articulates the importance of multilingualism, but grapples with how linguistic diversity could be used as a pedagogical resource (Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir 2004; Heugh 1999). Recognition of previously marginalized languages as official languages has not contributed much to developing the economic and educational value of these languages. There are eleven official languages of South Africa (Afrikaans, English, isiXhosa, isiZulu, isiNdebele, Sepedi, Sesotho, Siswati, Setswana, Tshivenda and Xitsonga) but English remains associated with education and socioeconomic advancement (Kaschula 2004). Webb (1999) argues that this is a regression to the days of monolingualism, thus creating in post-apartheid South Africa a situation where English continues to play a dominant position.

Literature Review

This section examines research that has been conducted on classroom CS to give an overview of various viewpoints of scholars on the use of CS in classroom situations.

In examining the issue of linguistic diversity in educational contexts and more specifically, research approaches that could be used to interrogate the use and relevance of CS in classroom situations, it is imperative to take note of trends of research on classroom CS which have been prevalent in the past. Martin-Jones (1995) states that research on classroom CS began in the mid-1970s with a debate on the impact of CS on

children's language development. Initial studies on classroom CS focused on calculating instances of the use of the learners' first language (L1) in classrooms (see Wong-Fillmore 1980). Later research introduced the functional coding approach as could be seen in the studies conducted by Milk (1981) and Guthrie (1983). Later studies from the 1990s up to the beginning of the twenty-first century relied on interactional sociolinguistics and ethnography of communication (Gumperz 1982, 1986). These studies include the research of Lin (1990, 1996, 1999, 2006), Merritt et al. (1992), Adendorff (1993), Ndayipfukamiye (1993), Martin-Jones (1995), Heller and Martin-Jones (2001), Heller (1999, 2001) and Simon (2001).

Amongst scholars who addressed the phenomenon of classroom CS in South Africa in the 1990s and early 2000 are Adendorff (1993), Peires (1994), Kieswetter (1995), Marawu (1997) and Kamwangamalu (2000). Adendorff examined CS as a communicative and learning resource in classroom situations. Peires (1994) observed groups of students who were discussing their school work using CS as a vehicle to share information. Kieswetter (1995) also examined how students from selected schools used CS to enhance their understanding of the subject matter. Kamwangamalu (2000) argued that teachers use CS to express oneness with the learners. In a situation where information is presented to learners in a language they are not familiar with at home, the solidarity function of CS is important in alleviating linguistic differences between the language used at school for teaching and the child's home language. A child's home language plays a crucial role in their educational development. As also mentioned in the UNESCO report (1953: 11), it is 'axiomatic that the best medium for teaching a child is his mother tongue.'

More recently, in her review of research that has been done on classroom CS in the past three decades, Lin (2013) calls for a new research approach to classroom CS. She identifies four main factors which have thwarted the advancement of research on classroom CS:

1. Studies tend to be descriptive rather than design-interventionist
2. Lack of 'disciplinary plurilinguals'
3. Scarcity of theory-driven research questions

4. Lack of variety in the research questions and research designs (Lin 2013: 214–6)

Further, Lin (2013) argues that studies have tended to focus on giving descriptions of existing CS practices in classrooms. This has been the case, because for some time, the use of CS in classrooms has been frowned upon by authorities and in some instances also parents who believed that education could be only attained through the use of foreign languages which are perceived to be the languages of socioeconomic advancement. Researchers, therefore, had the mammoth task of performing a 'legitimating motive' (Lin 2013: 214) or 'normalising mission' (Rampton et al. 2002: 375) through their research. Several studies (Lin and Martin 2005; Forman 2007; Macaro 2009) concentrate on describing instances of CS so as to prove their pedagogical importance. Lin goes on to argue that classroom CS research must now shift from the 'normalising mission' and begin to critically analyse existing approaches to classroom CS. Furthermore, researchers must use 'multiple research paradigms and methods, both interpretive and experimental' (Lin 2013: 215).

Studies in the past three decades focused on this 'normalising mission' (Adendorff 1993; Peires 1994; Kieswetter 1995; Marawu 1997; Kamwangamalu 2000) by trying to answer the crucial question of whether CS has any pedagogical value.

In addition to the plea for new paradigms and approaches to classroom CS, Lin (2013) also calls for theory-driven research questions on classroom CS. She points to the need for research literature 'to build up an expanded, diversified repertoire of theoretical frameworks.' The development of theoretical frameworks will lead to new research questions that will mark a shift beyond focusing on the 'good sense or rationality' of CS instances in classroom situations (Lin 2013: 215).

The fourth point Lin (2013) makes about classroom CS pertains to the lack of variety in the research questions and research designs. Lin argues that studies on classroom CS have been 'one-shot' or 'cross-sectional,' and suggests that 'instead of one-shot classroom video/audiotaping studies, we need to have studies that follow the same classroom for a longer period of time; for example, a whole course, a whole semester' (Lin 2013: 219). Furthermore, classroom CS research must also focus on students'

CS instances as well as written CS. Also, she calls for the involvement of teachers in research as teacher-researchers as well as students as student-researchers so that their voices and insights on their CS practices can be heard. Finally, she points out the need for research that would compare CS in both language and content classrooms (Lin 2013: 216).

Research Questions

This chapter explores the following three research questions:

1. Does a teacher's CS assist learners in understanding the content of the subject?
2. What is the pedagogical value of MT use in L2-medium classrooms?
3. What are the pedagogical functions of CS?

Methodology

This study was conducted in a township school in one of the cities of South Africa. The township school was selected because CS is prevalent in rural and township schools where most learners and teachers share the same MT. The participants of this study were a junior secondary school teacher and her grade eight learners. Purposive sampling was used to select the teacher and the learners who participated in this. The teacher was deliberately selected because she confirmed that she used CS to interact with her learners. Also, the teacher and the learners were chosen because they were bilingual in English and Xhosa. This study used mainly a qualitative method as the researcher was observing the class over a period of time, focusing on the teacher's communicative behaviour as she interacted with her learners in the classroom.

As the main aim of this study is to examine the communicative patterns of the teacher and her learners, qualitative data sampling enabled me to get a better understanding of their communicative repertoire. The data for in-depth analysis was collected directly from the teacher and her learners, and served as a mirror of the participant's views, feelings and

opinions about the use of CS in educational settings as well as its underlying pedagogical implications.

I chose to be a non-participant observer so as to collect natural data about the way the teacher and her learners interact. As an English/Xhosa bilingual myself, it was easy to understand the teachers' CS behaviour. Also, being a non-participant observer limited the prejudice or preconceived ideas about CS, or about this particular context, and instead enabled me to observe its pragmatic use as the lesson unfolds (Marawu 1997: 20).

As this study falls within the parameters of interpretive research, methods such as self-report, interviews and observation were used to collect data. I also used a video recorder which was operated by an assistant researcher. This gave me ample time to observe the interaction between the teacher and the learners, while they were being recorded. The transcribed video recordings of the classroom activities made it easy to analyse the interactions in detail.

Data Analysis

In this section, I analyse the teacher's communicative repertoire as she interacted with her learners. The data that are analysed are based on the history lessons of a grade eight teacher in a township school in South Africa. The history lessons are on the Industrial Revolution in Britain. The analysis focuses on the three research questions introduced above.

Does a Teacher's CS Assist Learners in Understanding the Content of the Subject?

The main purpose of this section is to analyse whether CS instances used by a teacher enhance the learners' understanding of the subject matter. In most multilingual schools where English is the language of instruction, teachers are faced with the dichotomy that emergent bilingual learners might not have a sufficient level of proficiency in English to understand the lessons. The question is whether CS, which is prevalent in bilingual

and multilingual classroom situations, enhances the learners' understanding of the subject matter. In the transcription below, an English translation of the phrases and utterances in isiXhosa is provided between square brackets (Teacher = T; Pupil = P).

Extract 1

1. T: Now we are coming to the characteristics of the industrial revolution (she writes this on the board) The first one is, The steam power and the steam engine (she writes this on the board.) Just as petrol is necessary in driving a motor engine, steam power is necessary in driving factories I mean factory machines, *siyevana?* [are you with me?] *Njengokuba uyazi ukuba imoto ayihambi ngaphandle kwepetrol, uyaqonda?* [Just as you know that a car does not move without petrol, understand?]
2. P: Yes!!
3. T: ... so *ne-ne-nesteam* power was necessary to do what? To drive factory machines, siyevana? […the..the ..the steam……….are we together?]
4. P: Yes!!
5. T: *Kufuneka ucinge ngemoto. Imoto ayikwazi kuhamba ngaphandle kwepetrol, siyevana?* [You must think of a car. A car cannot move without petrol, are you with me?]
6. P: Yes!!
7. T: And *nasezifactory…. ifactory azikwazi kusebenza ngaphandle kwantoni?* [... in factories…. factories cannot operate without what?]

In turn 1, with the switch to isiXhosa, the teacher intensifies what has been expressed before in English. The switch to isiXhosa is a conceptual translation of the English expression—it is used to explain and reinforce what she has already stated in English. She also uses it to reformulate the English explanation. The switch to isiXhosa is what Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain term 'a strategy by which bilingual speakers reformulate the same utterance in a different code' (Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2005: 237). This switch performs a discourse-related function in a pedagogical setting. It is also worth noting that in turn 3, the teacher switches back to English after ensuring that the learners have understood the content of what she wants to say to them.

Furthermore, the teacher uses *siyevana?* [Do we hear each other?] and *uyaqonda?* [Do you understand?]. She does so primarily not to elicit response but as a contextualization cue (Gumperz 1982) which helps structure her discourse. These discourse markers create a turn-taking system between the teacher and the learners, which serves as a pause for the teacher to either switch to isiXhosa or English.

The expression in turn 5, *kufuneka ucinge ngemoto* [you must think of a car] is uttered in a low tone. It is like an *aside* that is meant to help the learners create an imagination of a car—something they already know in order to help them understand the point in her exposition. This will enable the learners to create a smooth transfer of knowledge from the known to the unknown. Also, the variation in tone (when articulating the switch to isiXhosa) helps the teacher to express the sociocultural identity she shares with her learners. However, the switches to isiXhosa are not only an expression of social solidarity but are also used by the teacher to negotiate meaning with the learners (Martin-Jones 1995: 98). From this example, it can be concluded that the teacher relies on CS to facilitate learning, but there is no evidence of learning actually having taken place.

What Is the Pedagogical Value of MT Use in L2-medium Classrooms?

In some instances, the teacher not only uses CS but also uses isiXhosa to drive her point home to the learners. Extract 2 is one instance where the teacher simply uses isiXhosa to interact with the learners.

Extract 2

1.	T:	What is coal? icoal *yintoni?* [What is coal?]
2.	P:	*Ngamalahle.* [Coal]
3.	T:	*Niyaziqonda eza train zakudala? Zazihamba ngantoni?* [Do you know the – trains that were used in the olden days]
4.	P:	*Ngamalahle.*[Coal]
5.	T:	*Zazihamba ngantoni?* [What put them in motion?]
6.	P:	*Ngamalahle.*[Coal]

One study conducted in South Africa observed that teachers mainly opt for the use of isiXhosa to deliver lessons. Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir (2004: 78) argue that use of isiXhosa in classrooms is common among teachers in South Africa: '[o]bservations showed that isiXhosa was generally used for most of the talk time in the classrooms with some English code-mixing and code-switching taking place.' This raises the critical question of whether it is necessary for these learners to receive education in English, when in reality, they are taught in isiXhosa. In another study in South Africa, Desai (2001: 331) made a similar observation: '[i]t was apparent that, except for the English classes, the teachers used mainly isiXhosa to convey information to the learners.'

Therefore, it could be argued that teachers use isiXhosa to enhance content learning and understanding of the subject matter. As demonstrated in the excerpt above, the learners respond to the teacher in isiXhosa. It is also clear in Extract 2 that the teacher's main aim is not to teach content and language simultaneously. Moreover, English language teaching is a specialized field; therefore, it cannot be 'assumed that teachers of all subjects can assist in the teaching of English' (Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir 2004: 71).

Krashen's (1983) distinction between 'subconscious language acquisition' and 'conscious language learning' underlines that second language teaching is a specialized field. Krashen (1983: 1) adds that language acquisition 'requires meaningful interaction in the target language – natural communication – in which speakers are concerned not with the form of the utterances but with the messages they are conveying and understanding.' Furthermore, 'conscious language learning' involves 'error correction and the presentation of explicit rules.' This requires teachers who have been trained in second language teaching.

Most learners in rural and township schools have no 'meaningful interaction in the target language'; in other words, there is no 'natural communication' in their target language—in fact, this cannot be expected as they have their own MT in which 'natural communication' occurs. Teachers of content subjects, who are not L2 language teaching specialists and might not be fluent in the learners' target language, cannot be expected to offer this natural second language acquisition environment where there is 'meaningful interaction in the target language.' Therefore,

as seen in Extract 2, teachers rely extensively on CS into the MT for useful and meaningful engagement with learners.

Desai (2001: 331) also raises the critical point of assessments which have to be conducted in English even though students have been exposed to 'this isiXhosa-rich environment.' The paradox is that the subject matter is imparted to the learners mainly in isiXhosa (and they also respond in isiXhosa as can be seen in Extract 2), but assessments are done in English only. Furthermore, the contradiction between what the language policy promulgates and actual classroom practices leads to a situation where learners may understand the subject matter but fail to demonstrate this in writing because of poor proficiency in English.

What Are the Pedagogical Functions of CS?

A further issue in the study of CS in classroom situations is to ascertain its pedagogical functions. This is of fundamental importance since some scholars hold the view that CS is 'a grammarless mixture of two languages' (Grosjean 1982: 147). This has been a major concern of a number of researchers who study classroom CS from within a framework of interactional sociolinguistics and ethnography of communication, for example, Lin (1990, 1996, 1999, 2006), Merritt et al. (1992), Adendorff (1993), Ndayipfukamiye (1993), Martin-Jones (1995), Heller and Martin-Jones (2001), Heller (1999, 2001) and Simon (2001).

Turning to the present data, we can assess the pedagogical functions of the switches used by the teacher as she interacts with her learners. CS into the MT, it turns out, is used for purposes of emphasis and elaboration as well as repeating information already given in English. In Extract 3, the teacher uses isiXhosa words to emphasize what has been mentioned in English.

Extract 3

T: As you know that an increase in production of goods meant an increase in transport, there were only two ways at that time by which goods could be transported over land. It was by either use of horse power or rivers and canals. As you know that transport was needed to take those goods to the

markets, there were two means of transport used at that time, *amahashe nemilambo, siyevana?* Why do you seem not to agree, what about others? [....... horses and rivers, are you with me?]

In the above example, the teacher first gives her explanation in English. With this, she shows that she is aware of the official status of English as a language of teaching and tries to meet this obligation. However, she uses isiXhosa words to sum up the gist of her English explanation. In addition, she demonstrates that she is comfortable in using either of the two languages as an educational resource. The use of isiXhosa and English simultaneously refutes the impression that education can be acquired when offered in English only. CS, therefore, helps learners to value their own language as an important educational resource.

The Xhosa words the teacher uses in Extract 3 are not introducing new information in the lesson or unpacking any information the teacher has previously explained in English. The teacher uses the isiXhosa words *amahashe* [horses] and *imilambo* [rivers] to emphasize her point.

In the following extract, the teacher uses CS to reinforce what has been explained in English.

Extract 4

T: In order to improve transport, the investors started to see if the steam power which was used… erh… which was used in factories could be used to solve the transport problem ... so the investors were interested in knowing if the steam power which erh you know ... they wanted to know if *bangayisebenzisa ekusolveni Ie* transport problem cause *ezi zazislow kakhulu,* ihorse-power *necanals zasemlanjeni, uyaqonda?* [... they can use it in solving this .... these were very slow, that is, the horsepower and the river canals, understand?]

Using intra-sentential switches (switches which occur within a sentence), the teacher reinforces her English explanation with a switch to isiXhosa. She articulates intra-sentential switches with accuracy. These require syntactic and lexical restructuring without losing the meaning of the original source or language.

Furthermore, English is the matrix language in Extract 4 and isiXhosa is the embedded language. The matrix language is the language that receives linguistic items from another language, whereas the embedded language is the language that donates linguistic items to another language (Myers-Scotton 1993). The teacher's ability to use isiXhosa phrasal insertions in Extract 4 indicates that she does not do this because she is not fluent in English but shows that CS is an integral part of her communicative repertoire on which she relies as a pedagogical resource.

In Extract 5, the teacher uses isiXhosa to reformulate her English explanations.

Extract 5

T: ... *kwakufuneka into ezakuthi ikhawuleze ekutranspoteni* igoods to the markets [What was needed was something that could speed up transportation of goods to the markets]
... so experiments in the 19th Century succeeded in producing steam cars that were capable of carrying 14 passengers ... so during the 19th Century investors *za experimenta ukwenza ntoni? Ukwenza i-i-i-into enokuthi ikwelise* i-ipassengers *eziyi* 14 that is, *abantu abayi* 14, *uyaqonda?* [...investors experimented doing what? Doing something that could carry 14 passengers, that is, people who are 14, understand?]

The teacher uses reformulation both to sum up her English explanation and to make sure that the learners understand her lesson. According to Setati (1998: 37), 'reformulation is when the teacher paraphrases what has been said and does not add any new information or new instructions.' In Extract 5, the teacher does not add new information but clarifies her explanation in another code. In their explanation of reformulation, Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2005: 237) call it 'a strategy by which bilingual speakers reformulate the same utterance in a different code.' In the context of Extract 5, the teacher does not do reformulation in English but switches to the learners' MT to reformulate her statement. She hopes that if reformulation is done in the learners' MT, their understanding of the subject matter will be achieved.

The following example from Extract 5 shows how the teacher uses intonational variations when reformulating her explanations:

> ... so during the 19th Century investors *za experimenta ukwenza ntoni? Ukwenza i-i-i-into enokuthi ikwelise* i-ipassengers *eziyi* 14 that is, *abantu abayi* 14, *uyaqonda?*
> [...investors experimented doing what? Doing something that could carry 14 passengers, that is, people who are 14, understand?]

In the above example, the teacher uses a low-rise tone when switching to isiXhosa. Her tone rises when she produces this isiXhosa switch, *za experimenta ukwenza ntoni?* […experimented doing what?]. In a low tone, she answers her own question and the answer is a reformulation of the English explanation. By articulating in a low tone the isiXhosa switch, she prepares her learners for the next point in her lesson. The CS is also an expression of the bilingual identity she shares with the learners. It may be instrumental in empowering emergent bilingual learners who might struggle to access information in an *English only* classroom situation.

Furthermore, the change in tone serves as an attention-focusing mechanism and at the same time facilitates understanding of the explanation that was given earlier in English. It is worth mentioning that within her isiXhosa switch, she uses the word *passengers* but immediately unpacks it in isiXhosa for the benefit of the learners. This shows that she deliberately uses CS as a pedagogical resource.

Intra-lexical Switches

From the data, we also see that the teacher uses intra-lexical switches or nonce borrowings to ensure that learners understand her lesson. These are lexical items which do not necessarily undergo phonological adaptation, but their use is ephemeral in the recipient language. Khati (1992: 183) refers to intra-lexical switches as the use of morphemes from two languages within the same lexical item. Poplack (1985) uses the term 'nonce borrowing' when referring to intra-lexical switches since their occurrence is temporary and meant for specific purposes (Marawu 1997: 41).

The following are examples of intra-lexical switches used by the teacher during her lessons.

Ekusolveni [to solve]; Xhosa word e*ku* [to] is mixed with the English word *solve*:
Eku + solve = ekusolveni
Zazislow [were slow]; Xhosa word z*azi* [were] is mixed with *slow*:
Zazi + slow = zazislow
Ipassengers [the passengers]; the Xhosa prefix *i* is mixed with *passengers*:
i + passengers = ipassengers
Ekutranspotheni [to transport]; the Xhosa word e*ku* [to] is mixed with *transporting*:
Eku + transporting = Ekutranspotheni
Experimenta [experiment]; the Xhosa morpheme *a* is mixed with *experiment*:
Experiment + a = experimenta

It is interesting to note that the words she created do not affect the grammar and structure of her sentences as she switches codes. The teacher, for example, manages to reconstitute the words *ekutranspotheni* [in transporting] and *experimenta* [experiment] and, thus makes them assume a Xhosa phonetic form without major sound-changes. This shows that CS occurs to her as a spontaneous reaction, which she uses as an interactional resource with the learners.

Discussion

The research problem this study has been exploring is whether CS has any pedagogical value in classroom situations where the medium of instruction is the learners' L2. To find answers to this, the study was based on three research questions: the first research question was whether the CS instances used by the teacher are designed to assist the learners in understanding the content of the subject; the second focused on the pedagogical role of the learners' MT in L2-medium classrooms; the third research question pertained to the specific pedagogical-interactional functions of CS in classroom situations.

From the findings of this study, it is apparent that CS can be harnessed as a pedagogical strategy in classroom situations that are characterized by linguistic diversity. The data show that the teacher in the study is concerned mainly with empowering learners with the content of her subject. She uses CS as a pedagogical resource to ensure that learners understand the gist of her lesson irrespective of the language used to impart information. In this learning environment, CS becomes a flexible device used by teachers to empower with information learners who might not be fully competent and proficient in the medium of instruction. CS is used by teachers to meet the demands of the classroom; it is 'a key to the world of the participants and a means of alleviating the artificiality of the classroom from the learners' experience' (Ndayipfukamiye 1993: 83–4).

A second issue is the critical question of MT instruction. In the data, there are instances where the teacher uses isiXhosa to deliver her lessons. Learners too respond to the teacher in isiXhosa. The prevalence of isiXhosa use in township and rural schools where English is the official LOLT is also mentioned by Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir (2004: 78) in their study of CS in South Africa. Their finding was that 'although officially the school's policy declared that at the grade four level the transition from isiXhosa to English as the LOLT took place, the reality was much different.'

While some parents prefer English as the medium of instruction because of its association with socioeconomic advancement and MT instruction with Bantu Education (De Wet 2002), the continued use of isiXhosa as a pedagogical resource by teachers shows there is a practical need for indigenous languages to be used in education. Furthermore, this could also be seen as a challenge by teachers to the hegemony of English as a LOLT. The need to challenge linguistic hegemony is articulated by Shannon (1995: 177) when she argues that 'once a language achieves hegemonic status, dominated languages internalize that lowly status.' She goes on to state that 'in a counterhegemonic bilingual classroom, linguistic rights are ensured for all' (Shannon 1995: 198). In addition, multilingual pedagogies in classrooms are used to construct knowledge across the curriculum (Ndayipfukamiye 1993) and CS, in particular, is used to 'negotiate and renegotiate joint frames of reference and to exchange meaning' (Martin-Jones 1995: 98).

Furthermore, it has been observed that research on classroom CS focused on the pedagogical relevance of CS to classroom situations (Lin 1996; Adendorff 1993; Peires 1994; Martin-Jones 1995; Ndayipfukamiye 1993; De Wet 2002; Vorster 2008; Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir 2004). Most studies state that classroom CS has a pedagogical role, and the data analysed in this chapter also confirm that classroom CS has a role to play in multilingual educational settings. It has been noted in this study that the strategic use of CS for purposes of reformulation of expressions, clarification of concepts and display of emphasis is strongly represented in the teacher's discourse. However, Lin (2013: 215) argues that future research on classroom CS should not merely describe the functions of CS in classrooms but focus on a more critical approach to it using 'multiple research paradigms and approaches,' for example, a combination of interpretive and experimental approaches.

The use of CS and indigenous languages as pedagogical resources is a complicated issue in ex-colonial countries. In South Africa, the misconception among some parents that English-only education means better education and access to economic advancement still prevails (Vorster 2008). Similarly, in countries like Burundi, French is perceived as a language of prestige (Ndayipfukamiye 1993), while in Hong Kong, an official referred to CS as 'Chinglish' which is undesirable in classrooms (Lin 1996: 49). However, CS remains a widespread phenomenon in multilingual schools as the case is in countries like Botswana (Arthur 1996) and Tanzania (Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir 2004).

For South Africa and other countries where CS is used in classrooms as a teaching strategy, it is imperative that the use of indigenous languages for pedagogical purposes is given due attention. There is a need for society to be educated about the educational value of using CS and also MT instruction. This will require development of materials and training of teachers in MT instruction and use of CS as a pedagogic resource.

Conclusion

This chapter focused on the use of CS as a classroom strategy in learning situations where teachers and learners share the same MT. It has been noted that CS is a flexible strategy which teachers use to meet

classroom demands. Data analysis confirmed the pedagogical value of CS in classroom situations. Reviewed literature also showed that CS can be harnessed as a classroom strategy but there is a need for further research on how it could be better used as a pedagogical resource with a critical edge to it. However, some South Africans view with suspicion MT use in education because of past experiences of Bantu education. This creates a situation where the hegemony of English is perpetuated while indigenous languages remain marginalized with no role as pedagogical resources. Noteworthy is the fact that the teacher's CS practice, observed in the collected data, challenges the hegemony of English in classroom situations.

References

Adendorff, R. (1993). Code switching amongst Zulu-speaking teachers and their pupils: Its functions and implications for teacher education. *Language and Education, 7*(3), 141–162.

Alexander, N. (1999). *English unassailable but unattainable: The dilemma of language policy in South African education* (PRAESA – Occasional Papers, 3). Cape Town: PRAESA

Arthur, J. (1996). Code switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. *Linguistics and Education, 8*(1), 17–33.

Beukes, A.-M. (1992). Moedertaalonderrig in 'n demokratiese Suid-Afrika. *Per Linguam, 8*(1), 42–51.

Brock-Utne, B., & Holmarsdottir, H. B. (2004). Language policies and practices in Tanzania and South Africa: Problems and challenges. *International Journal of Educational Development, 24*(1), 67–83.

de Wet, C. (2002). Factors influencing the choice of English as language of learning and teaching (LoLT) – a South African perspective. *South African Journal of Education, 22*(2), 119–124.

Desai, Z. (2001). Multilingualism in South Africa with particular reference to the role of African languages in education. *International Review of Education, 47*(3–4), 323–339.

Fasold, R. W. (1993). *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford/England/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Forman, R. (2007). Bilingual teaching in the Thai EFL context: One teacher's practice. *TESOL in Context, 16*(2), 19–24.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1986). Interactional sociolinguistics in the study of schooling. In J. J. Cook-Gumperz (Ed.), *The social construction of literacy* (pp. 45–68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guthrie, L. F. (1983). Contrasts in teachers' language use in a Chinese-English bilingual classroom. In J. Handscombe, R. A. Orem, & B. P. Taylor (Eds.), *TESOL '83: The question of control. Selected papers from the Annual Convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages* (pp. 39–52). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Heller, M. (1988). *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.

Heller, M. (2001). Legitimate language in a multilingual school. In M. Heller & M. Martin-Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference* (pp. 381–402). Westport: Ablex.

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

Heugh, K. (1999). Languages, development and reconstructing education in South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development, 19*(4–5), 301–313.

Heugh, K. (2000). *The case against bilingual and multilingual education in South Africa* (PRAESA – Occasional Papers, 6). Cape Town: PRAESA

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2000). The state of codeswitching research at the dawn of the new millennium (2): Focus on Africa. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, 18*(1), 59–71.

Kaschula, R. (2004). South Africa's national language policy revisited: The challenge of implementation. *Alternation, 11*(2), 10–25.

Khati, T. (1992). Intra-lexical switching or nonce borrowing?: Evidence from Sesotho-English performance. In R. K. Herbert (Ed.), *Language and society in Africa: The theory and practice of sociolinguistics* (pp. 181–196). Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand Press.

Kieswetter, A. (1995). Code-Switching amongst African High School Pupils. *University of Witwatersrand Occasional Papers in African Linguistics (1)*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Krashen, S. (1983). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(2), 234–247.

Lin, A. M. Y. (1990). *Teaching in two tongues: Language alternation in foreign language classrooms* (Research Report, 3). Hong Kong: Hong Kong City Polytechnic.

Lin, A. M. Y. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance and code switching in Hong Kong Schools. *Linguistics and Education, 8*(1), 49–84.

Lin, A. M. Y. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 393–412.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2006). Beyond linguistic purism in language-in-education policy and practice: Exploring bilingual pedagogies in a Hong Kong science classroom. *Language and Education, 20*(4), 287–305.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review, 4*(1), 195–218.

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

Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35–49). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Marawu, S. (1997). *A case study of English/Xhosa code switching as a communicative and learning resource in an English medium classroom.* M. Ed. thesis, Rhodes University.

Martin-Jones, M. (1995). Code-switching in the classroom: Two decades of research. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on CS* (pp. 90–111). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Merritt, M., et al. (1992). Socialising multilingualism: Determinants of codeswitching in Kenyan primary classrooms. In Eastman, C. M. (Ed.) Codeswitching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 13*(1–2), 103–21. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Milk, R. D. (1981). An analysis of the functional allocation of Spanish and English in a bilingual classroom. *CABE Research Journal, 2*(2), 11–26.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ndayipfukamiye, L. (1993). Code-switching in Burundi primary classrooms. In C. M. Rubagumya (Ed.), *Teaching & researching language in African classrooms* (pp. 79–95). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ndayipfukamiye, L. (1996). The contradictions of teaching bilingually in post-colonial Burundi: From Nyakatsi to maisons en étage. *Linguistics and Education, 8*(1), 35–47.

Oakes, D. (Ed.). (1988). *Illustrated history of South Africa: The real story*. Cape Town: The Reader's Digest Association South Africa.

Peires, M. L. (1994). Code switching as an aid to L2 learning. *Southern African Journal of Applied Language Studies, 3*(1), 14–22.

Poplack, S. (1985). Contrasting patterns of codeswitching in two communities. In H. J. Warkentyne (Ed.), *Papers from the Fifth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology* (pp. 363–385). Victoria: University of Victoria – Department of Linguistics.

Rampton, B., et al. (2002). Methodology in the analysis of classroom discourse. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 373–392.

Republic of South Africa (RSA). (1996). 'The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa', Act No. 108 of 1996, *Government Gazette*, 378, 17678. Cape Town: Government Printers.

Setati, M. (1998). Code-switching in a senior primary class of second-language mathematics learners. *For the Learning of Mathematics, 18*(1), 34–40.

Shannon, S. M. (1995). The hegemony of English: A case study of one bilingual classroom as a site of resistance. *Linguistics and Education, 7*(3), 175–200.

Simon, D. L. (2001). Towards a new understanding of codeswitching in the foreign language classroom. In R. Jacobson (Ed.), *Codeswitching worldwide 2* (pp. 311–342). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

UNESCO. (1953). *The use of vernacular languages in education* (Monographs on Fundamental Education, 8). Paris: UNESCO.

Vorster, H. (2008). Investigating a scaffold to code-switching as strategy in multilingual classrooms. *Pythagoras, 67*, 33–41.

Webb, V. (1999). Multilingualism in democratic South Africa: The over-estimation of language policy. *International Journal of Educational Development, 19*(4–5), 351–366.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1980). Learning a second language: Chinese children in the American classroom. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Current issues in bilingual education: Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics* (pp. 309–325). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.