English-Thai Code-Switching of Teachers in ESP Classes

Korawan Promnath

Chamaipak Tayjasanant

Kasetsart University

Abstract

The term code-switching (CS) that occurs in everyday situations, or naturalistic code-switching, has been a controversial strategy regarding whether it benefits or impedes language learning. The aim of this study was to investigate CS in conversations between teachers and students of ESP classes in order to explore the types and functions of CS usually used in the teaching and learning process, and to investigate the teachers' and students' opinions about CS in classroom practice, particularly in English for nursing and tourism classes.

The study found that code-switching was one of the major strategies in these ESP classes. CS in the teaching process could be categorized according to the following: inter- sentential switching, intra-sentential switching, extra-sentential switching, and code selection. The CS functions were both pedagogical (asking questions, giving explanations, translating,

and emphasizing ideas) and social functions (directing, reminding, injecting humor, and encouraging students).

The majority of the teachers demonstrated positive opinions about CS and agreed that   CS from English to Thai could benefit their classes, as it is one of the most effective strategies for helping their students obtain clear ideas on the subject matter. This strategy not only made the students understand more of the lesson but also increased their confidence and comfort in the teaching process. The CS characteristics and opinions found in this study may provide a guideline for language teachers and policymakers, especially in EFL countries in the AEC and in this global era.

Keywords: code-switching, English for Specific Purposes, target language, students' mother tongue

Introduction

As a member of the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), Thailand has increased the importance of the role of English communication both public and private sectors. Since English has been claimed as the working language in the region, and it is also used for traveling and seeking educational opportunities, the provision of English medium instruction classes has increased, especially in some specific fields. English has been used more in the teaching and learning process. However, teachers' code-switching (CS) occurs from time to time for many reasons. Using the student's language or CS in English classes has been a controversial strategy among scholars as to whether it is useful or impeding to switch back and forth between the target language and the students' language in the classroom.

In Thai universities, students that choose to take English as their language subject are usually required to study at least four compulsory English courses (Wiriyachitra, 2002). Foundation courses 1 and 2 focus on integrated skills, and the others may be

English for academic purposes (EAP) or English for specific purposes (ESP) courses as required by each major. These courses increase English teachers' burden in various specific fields, such as science, law, nursing, medical, and so on. In order to create the target language atmosphere, many educational institutes have tried to persuade all teachers to use English as the medium of instruction in the classroom, and after many years, ESP teachers have gained more experience in teaching these specific fields. However, students' L1 emerges from time to time to ensure the students' understanding. Studies of CS in the classroom in Thailand, especially the opinions regarding the usage of L1 in the language classroom, are still rare. Thus it is worth studying how and why the switching occurs. This can be done by using conversational interaction to explore the characteristics of CS in ESP classroom conversations. Moreover, what teachers think a5bout using CS in the classroom needs to be further explored in order to gain some clarity regarding the Thai university context. The study of the opinions towards CS will also benefit other English teachers in terms of what characteristics of CS should be applied to use in class, which will shed some light on how the administrators or policymakers of the institute can encourage and improve CS in the classrooms for constructive purposes.

Literature Review

This part of the paper discusses the CS concept, including its definition, types, and functions, as well as previous CS research.

Definitions of Code-switching

Different researchers have explored different perspectives about the phenomena of CS. For example, Nunan and Carter (2001) and Myers-Scotton (1993) defined the term CS in terms of its typical characteristics. CS is the alternation of the two languages (or more) in the same discourse, or the alternation of linguistic varieties within the same conversations.

Gumperz (1982) defined CS in terms of its grammatical system, while Adendorff (1996) defined CS as a communicative resource in the classroom, enabling teachers and students to accomplish a considerable range of social and educational objectives. According to Gumperz, the switch can happen within words, phrases, clauses, or sentences, which is only a switch in the language, not an integration of words, clauses, or sentences into the another language. That means that CS that happens within the same speech belongs to two different grammatical systems or subsystems.

The above definitions are the usual structural terms of CS, referring to CS in the language classroom. It is the alternative use of at least two languages, or varieties of the same language, one of which is the second language, which is the target language, and the other is the native language of the learners or the speakers.

CS Types

Code-switching may be categorized into different types as follows.

Poplack (1981, as cited in Hammers and Blanc, 1989) introduced tag-switching or extra-sentential switches, which are tags and fillers, including an exclamation, a parenthetical statement or a particle from another language. An example of extra-sentential switching is "Nothing lah." Lah is a particle widely used in the colloquial speech of Malaysians. Also, "lah" is used for informal intimacy and solidarity.

Appel and Musyken (1987) and Clyne (2000) classified the alternate use of two languages either within a sentence or between sentences as intra-sentential or inter-sentential. Intra-sentential CS is the switch of languages occurring in the middle of a sentence and is sometimes called "code mixing." An example of this type of switch is "My youngest sister ambil biology." "Ambil" means "take" in the Malay language. This Malay word is embedded in an English sentence. Inter-sentential CS, on the other hand, is the switch of a language that occurs between sentences. An example of inter-sentential switching is "I quit all my jobs already.

Christie tak beritahu?" "Tak beritahu" means "did not tell." The latter is in Malay while the former is in English, and the ideas of those two sentences must be related. Clyne (2000) also classified the switching into extra-sentential switching, which refers to tags or fillers that do not exist in the lexicon of base language use.

Apart from the grammatical classification above, types of switching can be classified according to the length of the switching. The switching that uses sections of two languages that are longer than a sentence, is defined as *code selection.* Richards and Schmidt (2002) defined it as the selection of a particular language occurring when people select one code for certain purposes with certain people.

According to the definitions above, it can be inferred that switching can be classified into four main types: inter-sentential switching, intra-sentential switching, extra-sentential switching, and code selection.

CS Functions

CS researchers have focused on different functions of code-switching and other factors that influence switching. CS functions are categorized as social functions and academic functions. The former functions are categorized as representative (a message in one code is repeated in another code, either literally or in modified form), directive (implied the CS as it rings of power), expressive (showing some consideration for the interlocutor to infer sincerity), and declarations (formal code to show that it is serious and binding) (Soon, 1987). The academic functions are for clarification, translation, asking questions, checking comprehension, emphasizing ideas, and answering questions (Adendorff, 1993 and 1996). In terms of social functions, Adendorff classified them into switching for solidarity, and classroom management.

As seen from the studies above, the functions of CS in the classroom may not differ from the CS that occurs in everyday situations. However, Adendorrf's CS functions in the classroom, which are classified broadly into pedagogical and social functions,

can serve the purpose of learning and create solidarity in classroom contexts better.

Previous Research on CS

Code-switching is a debated issue in EFL classroom contexts. Some scholars consider the mother tongue as taboo, whereas others support it as a facilitator in learning the target language. Chambers (1991) stated that it is not necessary for learners to understand everything the teacher says. CS to the first language undermines the process of learning. Also Ellis (1984), Wong-Fillmore (1985), Lightbown (2000), emphasized, foreign language teachers should expose learners to as many language functions as possible in the target language. Ellis expressed the notion that the use of L1 by second language or foreign teachers will deprive learners of valuable target language input. Fillmore also stated that learners that are used to hearing their teachers use the L1 tend to ignore their target language and therefore do not benefit from the valuable target language input.

Although CS in the classroom has been a controversial issue, it has received great interest from many scholars and they have revealed that it is beneficial, as discussed below. Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (2005) examined CS in classroom discourse in terms of the combined set of communicative practices where speakers and listeners engage in real life conversation to pursue their communicative goals by interacting with each other. They selected excerpts from 3rd and 4th grade mainstream language art classes in California, and divided them into English monolingual and English-Spanish bilingual in order to examine the function of CS in both bilingual and monolingual interaction. They found that monolingual students switched sentence styles and voicing patterns, and bilingual students employed these strategies as well. According to Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz, the bilingual students employed CS to arrange their utterances and provided contextual cues and also produced CS to mark the talk as meta-comments.

Durano (2009) investigated attitudes towards English and Fil-English CS among high school students in a city in the Philippines and found generally positive attitudes towards English and Fil-English code-switching. However, more private school students than public high school students had a neutral attitude toward code-switching.

Haifa Al-Nofaie (2010) examined the attitudes of Saudi teachers and students toward employing Arabic as a facilitating tool in English classes. The results showed that the attitudes of teachers and students concerning the use of Arabic were generally positive in certain situations and for specific reasons due to their customs and culture.

In ASEAN countries, code-switching in universities has recently attracted many scholars' and linguists' attention. For instance, Canh (2014), has focused on code-switching in universities in Vietnam and Indonesia by examining the teacher's functions and motivation regarding the use of CS, while Ong and Zhang (2014) explored code-switching in universities in Singapore and the Philippines to explore the CS functional category of Singaporean English-Chinese bilingual students. Further, Azam and his team (2014), examined code-switching in universities of Brunei Darussalam and Malaysia by focusing on CS functions in lessons and the beliefs regarding CS of 3 teachers in various language centers.

In Thailand, not many linguists have paid much attention to CS in the classroom or in the bilingual or bidialectal communities. Tayjasanant (2014) conducted a study on two university teachers' CS, and their beliefs about CS. The findings revealed that the teachers produced three types of CS: tag-switching, intra-sentential, and inter-sentential switches, focusing on both pedagogical and social functions. One teacher that mainly spoke in Thai believed that switching languages was for knowledge transmission purposes, influenced by her former teacher, while the other teacher that for the most part used English had a strong belief in communicative language teaching from her teacher training.

The studies on CS can be classified as earlier and later studies. The earlier studies seemed to focus on CS characteristics or types and functions of why people switched, whereas the later trend focused more on the opinion or attitudes towards the switching. There appear to be two opposing opinions of the use of CS in the classroom: negative and positive. It can be said that if L1 is over used and is used unsystematically, it can demotivate the students' use of L2 in many ways. However, using L1 as a learning tool can be beneficial for the students' language learning, as long as it is carried out in an appropriate proportion based on the students' proficiency levels.

As Thailand is now a member of the AEC, it is considering the usage of English as a language for teaching and learning, especially in ESP classes in universities. This study attempts to explore the characteristics of CS and teachers' opinions, both in the English for health science and liberal arts fields, in order to discover more appropriate ways to use CS.

Research Design

Objectives and Questions

The objectives of the present study were: 1) to examine the characteristics, types, and functions of code-switching in conversations between teachers and students in two ESP classes at a university in Bangkok; and 2) to investigate the teachers' opinions of teachers switching to L1 in the classroom.

The research questions were as follows:

1. What types and functions of code-switching do the teachers in ESP classrooms employ?
2. What are their opinions of CS in their ESP classes?

Setting and Participants

This study was carried out in two ESP classes: English for Nursing, and English for Tourism, at the selected university in Thailand. These two classes were purposively selected in order to include both the health science and liberal arts fields in the study. Two Thai teachers volunteered to participate in the study: Kath

and Joe. Both had obtained an M.A. and Ph.D. in TEFL and Applied Linguistics from prestigious universities in Thailand and abroad. The classes generally taught four skills related to their major subjects, each comprising between 35 and 45 students.

Data Collection and Analysis

The CS data were collected using classroom audio recording and observation during the entire second semester of academic year 2014, including semi-structured interviews. The transcriptions then were analyzed into the types and functions of the Thai language that the teachers switched to. The types of CS were analyzed were analyzed according to Clyne's (2000) notions: intra-sentential switching, inter-sentential switching, extra-sentential switching, and code selection; and the CS functions were analyzed according to the ideas of Adendorff (1996): academic and social functions. The functions were verified through the retrospective interviewing of those two ESP teachers.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted in order to gain more in-depth opinions of the use of CS. The interview of each teacher lasted 30-45 minutes, focusing on five main themes of CS in ESP classes. The interview findings then were validated by two verifiers in order to confirm the teachers' opinions.

Findings

This part of the paper reports two types of findings: 1) the characteristics of CS, CS types, and CS functions from classroom observations; and 2) the interview findings regarding the teachers' beliefs concerning the influence of CS in ESP classes.

The Characteristics of CS in Classroom Conversations

- *Number of Words*

Table 1 displays the words used in both L1 and L2 in the two ESP classes, including the number of times each teacher switched during the entire semester.

Table 1: Number of L1 and L2 Words Used by Teachers in Each ESP Class

Class	Percentage of L1 and L2 Words Used by Teachers				Total
	L2 words	%	L1 words	%	
Nursing (Joe)	17,972	73.0	6,644	27.0	24,616
Tourism (Kath)	10,653	75.0	3,577	25.0	14,230

Table 1 shows the number of L1 and L2 words that teachers spoke in the classes, suggesting that the CS into Thai of the teachers was quite salient. The more repetition that occurred, the greater was the number of words, as shown in the nursing class. Since the scientific contents in English for Nursing were quite difficult, the teacher repeated or tried to explain several times. Joe, the teacher of the nursing class, used the target language (English) 73.01% of the time, and 26.91% of the time was spent switching into Thai. In the English for Tourism class, on the other hand, Kath, did not have to repeat or restate her explanation as many times as Joe did. The total number of words used in this class was quite smaller, compared to that of the nursing class. The percentage of English and Thai used was 74.86% and 25.14%, respectively. The overall number showed that the ESP teachers used more English than Thai in their classrooms.

- ***Types of CS***

The types of CS used by the teachers in these ESP classrooms are presented from the highest percentage to the lowest percentage in Table 2.

Table 2: The Teachers Code-switching Types

Types of CS	Nursing Class (Joe)		Tourism Class (Kath)		Total times
	Frequency of CS	%	Frequency of CS	%	
Inter-Sentential CS	686	55.6	319	54.6	55.3
Intra-Sentential CS	483	39.2	233	39.8	39.4
Extra-Sentential CS	52	4.2	22	3.8	4.1
Code selection	12	1.0	10	1.7	1.2
Total	1,233	100.0	584	100.0	100%

Table 2 presents the frequency of the teachers' CS to Thai. It was obvious that the teachers of both classes used similar types of code-switching: inter-sentential (55.3%), intra-sentential (39.4%), extra sentential (4.1%), and code selection (1.2%). Inter-sentential switching was the most salient among the four CS types. This may be because the character of the communication in each career needed to be quite formal, both in spoken and written forms. In order to communicate in classroom situations, the teachers had to explain different terms, ask questions, and check and translate sentences from English into Thai to promote the students' comprehension. Intra-sentential switching occurred when the teacher needed to present students with new vocabulary items with short translations within the English sentences, depending on the teachers' idea of the difficulty of the lesson at that time. The extra-sentential switching tended to occur only when the teachers wanted to get the students' attention, or to show informality or sociability in the class by adding fillers at the beginning or end of the English sentences. Here are some examples of the four types of CS, (the italicized words, the switching parts, were translated from Thai by the researcher.)

Inter-sentential CS

(1) T: Yes, why do not write? So, this is one week, PTA note. *Khao khian PTA yang ngai? Mai champen tong tem phro man mai pho (How did they write, PTA? No need to write too much in details because it's not enough. Write only one page).* It's not enough, so you can short cut, you can abbreviate.

(2) T: Status? It's taboo, *khao mai hai tham ruang sathanaphap (cannot ask about status.)* Not close friend, so are you married is not an acceptable question. It's a question that isn't acceptable.

The above extracts show the insertion of Thai switching into English sentences in order to provide more details, ask questions, and to direct or organize the class. The sentences could be short or long according to the teachers' ideas and the students' understanding.

Intra-sentential CS

(3) T: Next question, if a patient asked you if it was all right to substitute 100 grams of candy for 100 grams of potatoes, what would you say? You're in a hospital, you're in, *phanaek aria?(what department?)* Medical ward, okay Medical Department. Supposed you are in Medical Department, *phanaek ayurakaum chaimai? (Medical Department, right?)* Yes?

(4) T: Not *kham naenam (recommendation),* it's a verb. So when you translate, you try to think about it as a verb, *naenam (recommend, not kannaenam ru kannaenam (recommendation or suggestion.) karn (being)* means noun, right? Recommend is a verb, means suggest. We pronounce rec'commend, not re' commend. I highly recommend it, when do you use this sentence?

For the intra-sentential switching, the teachers inserted Thai words or phrases into the English sentence; at the beginning or in the middle, for short explanation, emphasis, or translation of only words to the students.

Extra-sentential CS

(5) T: Not computer, OK. Computed –ed *na krap (polite filler for male)* Computed, what?. Tomography. Computed Tomography. Can you see that on page 8? CT- scanner, it's coming from Computed Tomography.

(6) S: canned beer

T: Yes, in English *ha (okay?)* Canned beer, OK? What else? *Mmm*, what is it?

The extra sentential switching above (Mmm, ha, na krap) shows the social interaction used to get the students' attention and to emphasize the teachers' ideas. Sometimes there was a filler or tag at the end, such as *kha* or *khrap*, to confirm the ideas or to show politeness as a male or female speaker.

In addition to those 3 types of switching, the researcher also noticed longer switching between the target and students' native language, as can be seen in the following extracts:

Code selection

(7) OK, so that you bring out Thai culture. Thai culture, in our culture, we should be polite, we   should be thankful, grateful. I want you to put it because we have to include Thai culture, especially when you're talking to foreigners. *khaochai chaimai khrap rao tong nam wattanatham khong rao pai duai nakhrap; katanyu ru kankhopkhun man pen suan nung khong thini nai mahawittayalai rao nakhrap lae bangkhon ma chak tang changwat phua ma fang rao phut khae ha thung sip nati (Understand? We have to consider our culture; gratefulness is a part of HCU students' ehtic, and some people have come far, from other cities, just to listen to your 5-10 minutes talk.)* You have to be thankful.

(8) T: *Auh fang, mai champen tong long raila-iat na hen tham loei tong switch ma pen phasathai hai rao nai krum dai khuikan wa tha rao cha priaptiap Pratunam Platinum and Siam Paragon ni rao cha priaptiap nai ngae mum nai bang? Khammuan mi aria bang? Kham taktang khu aria bang? Yang saikanbin krum ni, Thai*

Airways and Nok Air, rao cha priaptiap praden nai; sentang kanbin, aria na? rakha tua khrungbin, yang mai tong long railaiat kho khae Topics ti rao cha priaptiap kon suan khammuan railaiat wa mi aria bang na, rao khoi wa kan to (Auh, listen. No need to go deep in details. I saw you ask your friends, so I'd better, switch, into Thai. OK. You talk to your group if we have to compare Pratunam Platinum and Siam Paragon Shopping Mall, how you're going to compare them; similarities, differences. Or this group, Thai Airways and Nok Air, which issues? Route? What else? Ticket price? Ok, no need to go deep in detail, just topics you're going to compare first. You'll go deep in detail later.) So you have to find out the topic that you'd like to compare. You search for the information first, like you're comparing the restaurants, check for atmosphere, kinds of food, price, and etc.

According to Barnard (2014), the longer switching presented is called longer stretches or 'long turn shift' or 'code selection,' which is the switching into L1 at above the sentence level. A teacher may begin with English sentences first, and then switch into Thai utterances, as seen in Extract 7 and 8.

- ### CS Functions

According to the transcripts, the retrospective interview on why the teachers switched in the observed lessons revealed the functions of the teachers' switching from the highest to the lowest percentage, as seen in Table 3:

Table 3: Analysis of CS Functions

Functions		Teachers			
		Joe	%	Kath	%
Pedagogical Functions	Translating	152	15.2	35	7.0
	Providing explanation	245	24.5	154	30.0
	Asking questions	297	29.7	84	16.3
	Checking Comprehension	48	4.8	67	13.0
	Emphasizing ideas	116	11.6	43	8.3
	Answering questions	3	0.3	2	0.4
	Providing Exemplification	3	0.3	7	1.4
	Reviewing	4	0.4	1	0.2

	Functions	Teachers			
		Joe	**%**	**Kath**	**%**
Social Functions	Organizing	7	0.7	17	3.3
	Directing	40	4.0	56	10.9
	Encouraging	21	2.0	6	1.2
	Admiring	6	0.6	3	0.6
	Reminding	35	3.5	25	4.9
	Injecting humor	22	2.2	12	2.3
	Complaining	-	-	3	0.6
	Requesting	2	0.2	1	0.2
Total		1,001	100%	516	100%

Table 3 presents the frequency of the functions with which the teachers code-switched in the observation transcript. The results showed that the two teachers alternated between English and Thai for pedagogical functions. For the nursing class, Joe switched to Thai in order to ask questions the most (29.67%), followed by other functions: to provide explanations, translations, and emphasis of ideas (24.47%, 15.18%, and 11.58% respectively). Kath switched into Thai for providing explanations the most (29.84%), followed by asking questions, checking comprehension, and emphasizing ideas (16.27%, 12.98%, and 8.33% respectively). Regarding the social functions, the two teachers tended to switch to Thai in order to direct and remind the students about what they should do in class, including organizing students' general behavior and injecting humor into the classroom conversations to reduce their stress and to build an amicable atmosphere. Examples of both the pedagogical and social functions described above are as follows.

CS for providing explanations
(9) T: See, only just these ones, you can identify the main idea. You can see sugar, diet; sugar in diet or sugar in diabetic patient. So meaning to say, you cannot get the whole sentence, *ach cha mai hen mai chai kankhian copy dai thuk kham nakhrap,*

khae trong ni ko hen main idea laew nakhrap (you may not see or copy all the words here, just here, you can see the main idea, OK?)

(10) T: Now, look at the second one, soup of the day. What does it mean, soup of the day? *sup pracham wan khu wanchan ko sup nung wan angkhan ku ik sup nung (Soup of the day, like this soup for Monday, Tuesday, they have another soup.)* So, the description says, 'ask your server for today's selection. *tha rao mai ru, chen wanni wanchan chaimai? tham wa mi sup arai, tham borikon loei (If you don't know, like today is Monday, you ask the waiter.)*

CS for questioning

(11) T: What is *'boil'? mai ru rer? (Don't know?)* It's not boiling water. It's like a pimple. *muan siu. (It's like a pimple!)*

S: *fi (boil)*

T: Yes, fi, *chai mai, khao ru duai (boil, right. She knew.)* So you want to move the patient from left to right. You check this one. There is no title, *mai mi huakho (no title, krap)*, so what do you do? No directions. It's a question and situation. This is not the thesis of statement of the problem. What is your opinion? Look at this! My belief though, it's still the opinion. *nai khwamkit khong phom, ni mai samat kaekhai panha dai (In my opinion, this can't help)*, So what is the opinion? *pen arai khrap? (So what is it?)* You skim for main idea.

(12) T: Back officer. *khu aria luk?(What is it?)*

Ss: *ti tamngan dan lang (Working somewhere inside the hotel.)*

T: *chaonati pracham yu dan lang, saunborikan nganrongram chen aria bang?(Staff who work in back office, who are they?)*

S: Receptionist

CS for emphasizing ideas

(13) T: Every time you talk to each other, with the doctor, it's okay. But if you talk to your patient, *cha bok wa*

Hypothyroidism, khao mai ru ruang na, bangkrang mai khuan chai, ya cha! (if you say, Hypothyroidism, they don't know. Sometimes, you shouldn't use those difficult terms, don't use them!) That's why you need synonym to describe them. *mua khui kap khonkhai nakhrap cha chai kham wa 'lotlong puamkhun ru sungkhun, low ru high ko pho, maichai (When you talk to patients, use 'decrease, increase, or high', OK, not,)* "You have hypothyroidism." They might say, 'Ha, what is that?'

(14) T:…. Which one do you prefer? Prefer, *plae wa aria? (what does it mean?)*

Ss: *chop (like)*

T: *chop, chop makkwa (like, like better).* Would you prefer to eat outside or inside? Would you prefer an aisle or window seat? Prefer, *tam duai khamnam na, kantham baep ni pen kantham phua hai khao dai luak nai alternatives thi rao mi (followed by noun, asking like this, is to give them choices of the alternatives that we have.)*

CS for translating

(15) T: *saraban (content),* yes, table of content. This is for report, it's formal, and complete, for essay, no! But you are going to do mini report here. You don't have to do it. When you compile them together, *wela ao ruamkan nakhrap (when compile them together),* it's the final. Then you need this.

(16) T: He's a driver. So a driver is talking to, *phudoisan (passenger),* a passenger. Listen again and try to catch the conversation that can show a conversation for a small talk.

CS for checking comprehension

(17) T: Carbohydrate. So one of the main ideas should be related to sugar, glucose, or carbohydrate. What else? What other words can you see? *nokchak nan yang mi kham sup arai ik, thi hen boi boi lae chai boi boi (Any other words that you use often?)*

(18) T: Weather? Yes, if you make a small talk, weather is easier, is normal. *Topic thi rao tham small talk dai chen din pa akat-- ron nakha (Topics which we can make a small talk, like weather, hot today nakha).* Is there anything else?

        S: Country, city

        T: City, country, tourist attraction, *chai mai? (right?)*

CS for reminding

(19) T: *tong ruchak na (You must know this na!),* what is nursing intervention? *Tha bok wa mai khoei dai yin loei khamsup ni rao chai kan boi na, chao thuk khung loei, thuk case leoi nakhrap (If you say, you never heard this, it has been used very often na, all the time, all the case, nakrap.)* Nursing management, nursing intervention, they are the same, nursing care!

(20) T: Hotel. How many people are there in the conversation? Who are they? *Tha top maidai wa sathanakan mi khai bang ko cha top maidai wa sathanakan nan take place thi nai (If you can't answer who's in the situation, you cannot answer where the situation takes place then.)*

CS for encouraging

(21) T: Haemophilus influenza can be treated by..

        S: Cephalosporin

        T: Yes, cephalosporins. See? As you practice, *ying fuek ko ying dai phro kankhian pen skill thi rao maikhoi dai chai (the more you practice, the better you are, because writing is the skill that you don't usually use)*, every now and then, we'll do it, *doichaphro text yangni (especially this text!)*

(22) T: Also, you'll hear the conversation and then check whether the statement is true or false. Before we are going to listen, I'd like you to read the following statements. It can help you to understand the conversation better. *long du na (Just try, OK)*

CS for directing

(23) T: *hai dao khwammai kham wa lachrymose (Try to guess of Lachrymose), the meaning of lachrymose. khui kan wa man yu trongnai, nai ni lae, khangbon ru yu nai nakhrap (Talk to your friends and find the meaning of it, where is it? It is in there in paragraph, up or where in the paragraph?)*

(24) T: Five? So today, I'd like you to sit in your group. Hurry up! Move!

Can you remember your group? Krisana, Yo! you move over there! Who else can't remember your group? *ao, move sikha (Hey, come on, move!)*

CS for organizing class

(25) T: The first sentence first. Read the first sentence. Okay, let's do it this way. Look at the noun. *khit sentai thuk kham loei nakhrap (Underline all the words!)* Underline all the nouns, the main nouns. What is the first one? What is the first noun? *phut loei (Speak up!)*

(26) T: OK, it's time for you to practice your listening. Let's take a look at the listening part on page 21. From this listening, listen to the directions. *fung di di na (Listen carefully!)* You'll hear 4 short conversations.

CS for injecting humor

(27) Ss: Ban Bangkae

T: Ban Bangkae? (Bangkhae Retirement Home) So, the institution here if you look at page 1, the second to the last word, institution here means the place, like a hospital, where is my pen? A hospice, it's a place for old people who don't have relatives, *mai mi yat na (no relatives na)* OK? Sometimes,.. *mi yat tae ko pai song wai nakhrap (or they have relatives, but they were left there!)*

(28) T: It's a conversation that we create to continue talking with the customers or a stranger, *kap khon plaekna ru lukkha, ngai ngai loei, rao doentang khondieo, chang muangthai pai yipun*

lae mi phuchai nung khangkhan, Boat, rao cha ploi hai khwamngiap rawang rao kap phuchai khon nan thung paet chumong mai? (with a stranger or customers.. Say, if you're traveling alone from Thailand to Japan, and there's a man sitting next to you, Boat. You and that man will keep quiet, like, for 8 hours?)

     S: No, kha

     As shown in Table 2 and 3, the teachers' switches were quite similar. They gave more explanations than asked questions in order to be sure of the students' understanding, mainly regarding inter-sentential and intra-sentential switching. Joe's code-switching from English to Thai was done quite consciously and naturally; he tended to give long explanations and examples and to ask some questions ending with the extra-sentential, *'na krab', na'*, to make sure that his students got the message. His students were more organized compared to the other class, as seen in their attempts to answer questions, some of which were in Thai probably because they could not answer them in English. Kath was patient with her tourism students, as can be observed from the explanations and additional examples given to her students. She switched to Thai mostly for providing explanations and asking questions, frequently at the inter-sentential level. She also switched to translate words, including those that she had corrected for her students.

Teachers' Opinions about Code-switching in the ESP Classes

     The interview findings can be categorized into five main themes: 1) the language that should be used for teaching ESP, 2) the need for switching in ESP classes, 3) the advantages of CS in the classroom, 4) the disadvantages of CS in the classroom, and 5) appropriate ways to code-switch.

Table 4: Teachers' Opinions about Code-switching in the ESP Classes

Questions	Joe	Kath
1. The language that should be used for teaching ESP	Teachers should use more English than Thai.	Teachers should use more English than Thai.
2. The need for switching in ESP classes	There should be CS in classes to ease students' comprehension.	CS in classroom can help both teacher and students in teaching-learning process.
3. The advantages of CS in the classroom	- more understandable/ easier to understand - effective in terms of class management - incorporate morality and ethics in class	- students' stress reduction - encouragement for students to express their feelings
4. The disadvantages of CS in the classroom	- time consuming - demotivating for talented students	- no target language-learning environment - no effort in using target language
5. Appropriate ways to code-switch	- CS for difficult or important lessons - CS only the beginning and reducing at the end of the course	- not word-by-word CS - CS for socializing

The language that should be used for teaching ESP

Concerning the language usage, both teachers agreed that they should use English (L2) more than Thai (L1), although the students' ability in English was rather low. Joe said that using more English as a tool of communication can create an environment for the students to use language better. However, whether the teachers could use the target language all the time or not depended on the ability of the learners to comprehend it. Even

though the mother tongue of the learner was essential, it should not be used in the classroom to communicate more than the target language.

Kath explained that language teachers were generally recommended to use the target language for communication in the classroom. Yet in real life, using the target language all the time at the beginning of the class was impossible. Teachers often use the students' first language along with the target language to help them compare and understand the basic level first, and to help them gain contextualized knowledge of the language.

The need for code-switching in ESP classes

Both teachers agreed that there should be language switching in the classroom, as it can help both teachers and students in many ways, e.g. to compare the differences and similarities between the two languages, and in terms of forms and meanings; to build their confidence; and to reduce their stress. They believed that CS can help students manage the class effectively. CS in the classroom also creates a bilingual atmosphere, particularly in the AEC era.

The advantages of CS in the classroom

Both teachers stated that CS was beneficial for the students' understanding. The teachers could see that their students were more secure and confident than when listening to English only. Kath said that CS was not only easy for students, but also for the teachers; it could save time and make students feel more confident and comfortable in their learning. Also, adopting CS could help students with lower performance to be able to follow the lessons better than using only English through the learning periods. Code-switching could reduce the students' stress and also make them feel free to make an effort to speak English by switching to Thai words sometimes when they could not think of what to say.

Joe also stated that CS was one of the best approaches that benefited the ESP class, particularly when there was difficult content or important message to emphasize. In addition, switching to Thai could help with effective classroom management and incorporate morality and ethics in the class. For the health science field, some students tended to struggle with technical words introduced to them for the first time. Teachers can help them by code-switching or translating them into Thai to help them to learn and use these technical terms for their future career correctly. He also believed that using L1 could motivate learners. He described that the teachers' ability to speak Thai enhance students in learning target   language even if learning is sometimes slow.

The disadvantages of CS in the classroom

According to the two teachers, CS might be a good strategy for efficiency in the ESP class, but switching back and forth all the time during class could be time consuming. It might be good when the teachers have prepared beforehand for the use of CS in each lesson to meet each goal. In addition, switching can demotivate talented students and decrease target language learning environment.

Appropriate ways to code-switch

The two teachers suggested that good CS could be done as follows.

- The two teachers agreed that switching into Thai has both advantages and disadvantages in the classroom context. For the question of how teachers can switch, those two teachers came up with the point that CS was not supposed to be carried out word by word; rather, switching should be done inter-sententially or intra-sententially. Teacher Kath also claimed that switching word by word rarely happened in her class. She said that it is not appropriate to do, both in spoken or written language. It was time consuming to do so.

- Both of the teachers agreed that the switching to Thai should be done for the emphasis of some important messages or difficult content in order to help the students understand. Joe added that switching to make a conclusion for each lesson can help students recall what they have just learnt. To do this can also help them realize what they missed during the lesson.
- Kath said that CS is appropriate when used for socializing and organizing the class. According to her, speaking English only sometimes could not get the students' attention. They paid more attention if teacher spoke Thai.
- Since the ESP for each major was more difficult for students than English foundation courses, teachers should code-switch during the first few weeks in order to help students gain more knowledge of each subject matter. CS should then be reduced at the end of the course. The students could be exposed to target language environment when teachers used more English.

From the interviews, it can be concluded that both teachers showed similar positive opinions towards code-switching in the ESP classroom. They agreed that code-switching can help students with their ESP learning. However, how much the teachers switch can be considered during the teaching-learning process, as Joe discussed in the following passage:

> "CS can be used to effectively manage class especially for explaining difficult topics. How much you switch to Thai depends on the students' level of proficiency, which can be seen during teaching - learning process: demotivation (as evidenced by talking with each other regarding the topic), facial expressions showing inability to follow the lesson, and low achievement scores, etc."

Adopting CS can help poor students follow the lessons better than using only English throughout the learning periods. When the teacher code-switches, it can make students feel free to make an effort to speak English. On the other hand, if the teachers speak English all the time, students might be reluctant to talk or ask questions. However, the use of CS may depend on the students' level of proficiency. It might be demotivating for talented students if the teachers code-switch too frequently, as Kath pointed out:

> "CS from time to time can help in reducing students' stress. I can see that students feel free to make an effort and try to speak English more, and not worry too much about grammar or vocabulary. They insert some Thai words into their sentences if they couldn't think of English words!"

Students' reaction to the teachers' use of L1 and CS

The two teachers also expressed the ideas that switching to Thai or using only English in teaching received different reactions from the students. At the beginning of the lessons, they used more Thai than English. As the lessons continued, they reduced the use of Thai and tried to use more English.

> "Of course we tried to reduce our switching to Thai; switching most often at the beginning, then used English more at the end of the course."

The students' reaction to when the teachers switched to the use of more Thai and more English was significantly different. The students participated more when the teachers used Thai. When the same questions were repeated in English, they tried to show their understanding by answering in English and added some Thai when they could not think of what to say in English, as they mentioned in the following:

"Students seemed to be relaxed when we switched to Thai. I guess it's because they understand more. That made them participated more during the lesson."

At the end of the lessons, the teachers used more English; the students tried to participate in English first, but with short words. The two teachers, however, switched to Thai at the end of the lesson from time to time when they noticed the demotivating factors during the teaching-learning process. This was evidenced by students talking with each other regarding the topic, or with their facial expressions showing the inability to follow the lesson. Joe stated the following in this regard:

"I used more English at the end of the semester and students gave their cooperation, but only from some good students. Sometimes I switched to Thai when I noticed some of them talked with each other about the topic, or had facial expressions to show that they could not to follow the lesson."

Discussion and Conclusion

The investigation of CS in the conversations between the teachers and students in the ESP classes can be concluded as follows.

The Characteristics of CS in Classroom Conversations

The proportion of the use of CS by teachers was lower than 30%, which was considered as a process or strategy in these two ESP classes. The types of CS in the teaching process can be categorized into inter-sentential, intra-sentential, extra-sentential, and code selection, which was different from the study of Poplack and Scheu (2000), which found that intra-sentential switching was used the most. The analyzed data contained several CS functions, classified as pedagogical functions (clarity, emphasis, asking questions, translation, and comprehension check) and social functions (organizing the class and encouraging students),

which were in accordance with the study of Adendorff (1996). The functions of CS were also confirmed through the retrospective interviewing of the teachers regarding their reasons for each switch. Formal code-switching was used as a pedagogical interaction in order to serve the goals of the course, and informal code-switching was used for socialization among the teachers and students to organize and create a good atmosphere in the classroom.

The results on the CS types and functions above imply that sentence-level switching was more beneficial for the students in the classes than word-level switching, as it may help enable students to acquire bilingual speaking skills in their real life in the AEC era. According to the findings, we can also see that the two teachers found it very useful to apply code-switching in their teaching, and this was similar to the belief of one of the teachers in Tayjasanant's study (2014), where it was claimed that using only English was not a good idea because the students in the study were at different levels. Adopting CS helped students with lower performance follow the lessons better than using only English throughout the periods. When the teachers code-switched, the students tended to feel free to make an effort to speak English.

Teachers' opinion towards the code-switching

The teachers' opinions of the CS in ESP classes concerning the five issues discussed above were as follows. First, the language used in teaching ESP should be English (students' target language) in order to create an environment for students to use English. Both teachers accepted that avoiding the L1 was impossible in Thai university contexts, but that there should be more target language use than the students' L1. Secondly, both teachers agreed that CS in the classroom was essential, and that the students' mother tongue can help both teachers and students in many ways. Third, the advantages of CS in classrooms were seen in terms of assisting with understanding, reducing stress, encouraging the expression of feelings, including managing classes effectively, and incorporating morality and ethics in the

classroom. Fourth, the disadvantages of CS in the classroom were that it was time consuming, offered no target language environment, and discouraged talented students. Finally, the teachers made it clear that CS should be for difficult or important lessons, and for socializing, and it would be good to switch only during the first few weeks of the course.

The teachers indicated positive opinions about code-switching in ESP classes for facilitating students' understanding and for managing the classroom. The positive opinions of this study are related to the studies of Durano (2009) and Al-Nofai (2010), which found that CS was a useful strategy in teaching text content and could help teachers better clarify classroom task instruction, reduce students' stress, encourage them to express their feelings, engage students' attention, and manage classes effectively.

The CS characteristics and teachers' opinions found in this study could encourage language teachers to consider when and why they have to switch during the teaching and learning processes to facilitate students' learning and understanding in more appropriate ways. Additionally, CS can give students, language teachers, and policymakers in adjusting themselves to bilingual or multilingual education in the AEC era.

There were some limitations to this study. The students' CS was not focused on in the study since the proportion of their use of L1 was higher than L2. This led to no clear evidence to support the question whether the teachers' use of more L1 would demotivate students from using their target language. Further, because of the students' tight schedule, their opinions of CS or the teachers' CS could not be explored.

The limitations of this study can provide some inspiration for further studies on students' opinions about teachers' use of CS in the classroom, and other related fields in Thailand and organizations in the AEC.

The Authors

Korawan Promnath completed her B.A. (1st Class Honors) at Huachiew Chalermprakiet University, receive an M.A. in Applied Linguistics from Mahidol University, and now is a Ph.D. candidate in Applied Linguistics at Kasetsart University.

Chamaipak Tayjasanant obtained a PhD in TEFL from the University of Exeter. She is an associate professor at the Department of Linguistics, The Faculty of Humanities, Kasetsart University, Thailand, and in charge of teaching both undergraduate and postgraduate courses with particular interest in teacher and learner psychology and classroom discourse.

References

Adendorff, R. (1996). *The Functions of Code-switching among High School Teachers and Students in KwaZulu and Implications for Teacher Education.* In K. Biley & D. Nunan (eds.). Voices from the Language Classroom: Qualitative Research in Second Language Education. pp. 388-406. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canh, L.V. (2015). *Code-switching in Universities in Vietnam and Indonesia.* In Barnard, R. & McLellan, J. (Eds.) Code-switching in University English Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives, 118-142.

Clyne, M. (2000). *Constraints on code-switching: How universal are they?* In Li, W. Ed). The bilingualism reader. London: Routledge.

Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching* (3rd ed.). Great Britain: Oxford University Press Inc.

Durano, Farahlexis (2009) *Attitudes Towards English and Fil-English Code-switching Amongst High School Students in Ormoc City, Philippines.* (Thesis) Malmö University Electronic Publishing.

Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom Second Language Development.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Fillmore, L. (1985) *When does teacher talk work as input?* In Gass SM, Madden CG, Eds. Input in second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Gumperze, J.J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies. Cambridge.* Cambridge University Press.

Gumperze. & Cook-Gumperz, J. (2005). *Making space for bilingual communicative practice.* Intercultural Pragmatic 2: 1-23.

Haifa Al-Nofaie (2010) *The Attitudes of Teachers and Students towards Using Arabic in EFL Classrooms in Saudi Public Schools- A Case Study.* Novitas-ROYA, Jourlib Journal ISSN: 2333-9721, 64-95.

Koziol, J.M. (2000). *Code-switching between Spanish and English in Contemporary American Society.* St. Mary's College of Maryland. St. Mary's City, Maryland.

Lightbown, P. M. (2000) *Classroom SLA research and second language teaching.* Applied Linguistics 21(4), 431-462.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-switching.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Numan, D. & Carter, D. (2001). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poplack, S. & Sankoff, D. (1981). *A formal grammar for code-switching.* Papers in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communication 14(1): 3-45.

Richards, J. & Richard, J. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics* (3th Ed.) Pearson Education Limited.

Soon, S. K. (1987). *Functions of Code-switching in Malaysia and Singapore.* The English Teacher Vol. 16, 11-23.

Tayjasanant, C. & Robinson, M. G. (2015). *Code-switching in Universities in Thailand and Bhutan.* In Barnard, R. & McLellan, J. (Eds.) Code-switching in University English Medium Classes: Asian Perspectives, 92-116.

Trudgill, P. (1983). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction.* England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Wiriyachitra, A. (2002). *English Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand in this Decade.* Retrieved August 2, 2015, from Thai TESOL Focus. http:www.//apecknowledgebank.com.