
University of South Australia

**The Library**
www.library.unisa.edu.au

*Educating Professionals, Creating and Applying Knowledge, Engaging our Communities*

This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an article published in *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* published online 31 May 2016, pp. 1-15, copyright 2016 Taylor & Francis, available online at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1189509.

# Teachers' code-switching in bilingual classrooms: Exploring pedagogical and sociocultural functions

Hilda Cahyani[a*], Michele de Courcy[b], Jenny Barnett[b]

[a]*State Polytechnic of Malang, East Java, Indonesia,*
*Postal address: JL. Soekarno-Hatta 9 Malang, East Java 65141;*

[b]*University of South Australia, SA, Australia,*
*Postal address: St Bernards Road Magill South Australia 5072*

hcahyani@yahoo.com; Michele.deCourcy@unisa.edu.au; Jenny.Barnett@unisa.edu.au

# Teachers' code-switching in bilingual classrooms: Exploring pedagogical and sociocultural functions

The pedagogical and sociocultural functions of teachers' code-switching are an important factor in achieving the dual goals of content learning and language learning in bilingual programs. This paper reports on an ethnographic case study investigating how and why teachers switched between languages in tertiary bilingual classrooms in Indonesia, where the main language of instruction was English. Data on code-switching were gathered in three classrooms over one semester, employing classroom observation with video and audio recording, semi-structured teacher interviews with some stimulated recall, and a focus group discussion. Transcripts of classroom interaction were examined using both an Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) perspective and functional categories of code-switching. Teacher reflections were studied, and analysis indicated that teachers' code-switching was frequently used to support students to gain understanding of unfamiliar concepts, where the pedagogical focus was on the subject matter more than on language. It also involved managing students' behaviour and engaging in interpersonal and affective interactions with students. The teachers' code-switching thus frequently functioned as translanguaging in that it occurred as an intentional strategy for teaching in these bilingual classrooms, integrating the two languages in order to achieve better communication and engagement in learning.

Keywords: teachers' code-switching; translanguaging; bilingual program; tertiary content classroom; Indonesia

Indonesia is a multilingual country where people predominantly use the national language (Bahasa Indonesia) for educational and formal purposes, whereas the vernacular languages (such as Javanese) are used for everyday spoken use. English is used for particular instrumental functions across the country, but it is hardly ever used for naturalistic communication outside the classroom. For this reason, using English as a medium of instruction in academic subject areas typically requires switching across languages in order to enhance both content learning and English language learning. This makes Indonesia an ideal site for researching teachers' multilingual code-switching and how it relates to these dual goals. Specifically, this paper provides an ethnographic study of how and why teachers switched languages while delivering their tertiary level

Accountancy and Business Administration classes. The analysis suggests the importance of going beyond the forms of code-switching to identify the pedagogical and sociocultural functions it can serve within the classroom. This has implications for teaching academic subject areas bilingually in diverse contexts around the world.

## Code-switching and translanguaging

Code-switching has been a central issue in bilingual research, illuminating our understandings of bilingualism (Cantone 2007). It is the systematic alternate use of two or more languages in a single utterance or conversational exchange for communicative purposes (Gardner-Chloros 2009; Levine 2011). Research into classroom interaction focusing on code-switching has the advantage of providing an understanding of the discourse of a shared identity and community among the interlocutors (Losey 2009). Code-switching is a natural way of communicating among bilinguals; thus the action to separate languages in a multilingual classroom by only using monolingual communication is unnatural (Kirkpatrick 2014).

Nevertheless, teachers' code-switching has been a controversial issue since it is sometimes performed subconsciously and automatically (Medupeola 2013, 93) rather than as an intentional teaching strategy. However, when teachers switch between languages in order to maximise their instruction, code-switching can function to enhance students' understandings and provide students with opportunities to take part in the discussion. Martin (2005, 89) noted that code-switching offers classroom participants 'creative, pragmatic, and safe practices… between the official language of the lesson and a language to which the classroom participants have a greater access'. This endorses research in the past few decades that confirms code-switching as a linguistic strategy rather than merely a language problem (e.g. Poplack 1980; Gumperz 1982; Myers-Scotton 1993). In activity related to comprehension and learning, the use of code-switching can be justified in a situation where teachers and students share pedagogical perspectives (Macaro 2014, 17). In classroom practice, code-switching can support communication and exploratory talk as a part of the students' learning (Setati, Adler, Reed & Bapoo 2002). However, teachers often discourage students from code-switching and insist they use the target language instead (Shin 2005). Teachers also frequently feel guilty and uncomfortable over using the L1 in the foreign language

classroom or in classrooms where English is the medium of instruction (Wang & Kirkpatrick 2013; Kirkpatrick 2014).

Like code-switching, the newer field of translanguaging can initially be defined as the practice of shuttling between languages in a natural way. However, translanguaging differs from code-switching in that it is not merely switching in and out of two separate monolingual codes but combines two languages as a unity to achieve effective communication: 'translanguaging posits that bilinguals have *one linguistic repertoire* from which they select features *strategically* to communicate effectively' (Garcia 2011b, 1). Thus, the focus in the concept of translanguaging is 'not on languages but on the observable communicative practice of bilinguals' (García 2011a, 147), taking bilinguals rather than monolinguals as the norm (García 2011b, 1).

Translanguaging in classrooms is where two languages are used in an integrated and coherent way to manage and facilitate the mental process of learning, whether by teachers or by students. Translanguaging has been seen as part of a movement in education from monolingual to multilingual education, and a modern model in bilingual classrooms (Garcia 2009). It is an action designed to access different linguistic features to augment communication. It is not merely using the two languages but also making meaning, and gaining understanding and knowledge through the integration of those languages. Heugh (2015, 283) sees translanguaging as a strategic use of code-switching involving cognitive engagement while working with two or more languages simultaneously rather than separately.

Baker (2011) calls such translanguaging *strategic classroom language planning*, where teacher and students can use two languages for both input and output. The emphasis in the notion of classroom translanguaging is more on the *functions* than on the *forms* of language, and more on the bilingual learning *process* than on its *outcomes* (Lewis, Jones & Baker 2012). Baker (2011, 289-290) summarises the four advantages of the pedagogical practice of translanguaging:

- it may promote a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter
- it may help the development of the weaker language
- it may facilitate home-school links and cooperation
- it may develop learners' second language ability simultaneously with content learning.

Translanguaging is thus not only for the business of teaching but also for engaging the audience to connect with their identity and linguistic repertoires (Creese & Blackledge 2010, 109-112).

In sum, both code-switching and translanguaging have been perceived as positive phenomena in the bilingual world to promote communication as well as to accomplish pedagogical objectives in the classroom. However, to date, research in code-switching has primarily investigated language interference and borrowing or transfer, while research in the newer field of translanguaging investigates phenomena that show how multilinguals are involved in their linguistic practice (Hornberger & Link 2012). It is this latter perspective which is adopted in the study reported here, identifying pedagogical and sociocultural functions of teachers' code-switching as part of their bilingual repertoire of professional practice.

## Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) and functional categories of pedagogic code-switching

For its analytic framework, this study employed an amalgam of interactional sociolinguistics (IS) and functional categories of pedagogic code-switching. IS, as a discourse analytic approach, aims to identify what participants in a conversation intend to convey in everyday communication (Gumperz 2008, 215). This focus on the meaning making process makes it suitable for use in ethnographic investigations which provide context to help interpret such meaning making, and thus also for investigating translanguaging.

A key element in Gumperz's theoretical framework (1982, 2008) is not only to glean the meaning from an interaction but also to make a prediction about what will come next in the interaction (Tannen 1992). In Gumperz's view, speakers are guided by their own interpretive norms in speaking, and consequently IS analysis goes beyond surface meaning to assess the communicative intention.

Another theoretical framework employed in this study relates to the pedagogical functions of classroom code-switching (Ferguson 2003, 2009). This taxonomy was drawn from Ferguson's meta-analysis across a range of code-switching research in different post-colonial settings. It classifies: (1) Code-switching for constructing and

transmitting knowledge/curriculum access, for scaffolding knowledge, annotation of key L2 technical terms and mediation of L2 textbooks; (2) Code-switching for classroom management, for signaling a shift/footing, managing pupils' behaviour such as: motivating, disciplining, and praising them, and (3) Code-switching for interpersonal relations for humanising classrooms.

Ferguson's model resonates with Halliday's work on the functional view of language (1994) which led Lin (2013, 202) to call code-switching a *communicative resource*. This includes code-switching to (1) provide basic L2 proficiency, as in ideational functions; (2) signal a topic shift, as in textual functions; and (3) negotiate social distance and convey in-group solidarity, as in interpersonal functions. The taxonomy of Ferguson's functional categories of classroom code-switching could be expected to fit the purpose of this study since the categories were drawn based on a series of studies reflecting classroom data in quite diverse contexts. Nevertheless, it is important to take account of the particular context of bilingual education in Indonesia, as well as in the actual research site.

## Bilingual education in Indonesia and the research site

Bilingual education in Indonesia was first used when vernacular languages (such as Javanese, Sundanese, Batak) were taught as a subject from elementary school to the end of junior secondary school. As the popularity of English increased, the teaching of a *local language* at some schools has been replaced by English, and since 1994 the teaching of English in primary school has been popular, though not compulsory. It is compulsory in junior and secondary schools. Among the ASEAN countries, Indonesia is the only country which does not require English as a compulsory subject in the primary education curriculum. This relates to the need to promote use of the national language as well as maintain local languages (Osman 2012).

In 2003 there was a movement at the school level to set up bilingual programs or RSBI (Pilot International Standard Schools) (Act of The Republic of Indonesia 2003). However, bilingual education at that level was officially terminated in January 2013 because it was criticised for discriminating against the poor in favour of the rich; it did not give equal opportunities for all Indonesian students and was only exclusively executed for students with high economic status (Hamied 2012; Margana 2013).

Therefore, nowadays the government encourages tertiary level institutions to open international programs, as proposed in higher education policy Number 12 (Act of The Republic of Indonesia 2012), in order to equip their graduates with English skills and make them more job-ready and competitive.

However, since students usually choose their first language or vernacular language for social discourse (Tarone & Swain 1995, 170), the effectiveness of English as a medium of instruction depends on the context of teaching, teachers' competencies and skills, and their aspirations and perceptions about their learners (Setati, Adler, Reed & Bapoo 2002).

The context of teaching in this study is a bilingual program at a vocational tertiary institution in Indonesia. Currently, the internationalisation of education in Indonesia encourages the establishment of bilingual or international programs at the tertiary level of education rather than at lower levels (Act of The Republic of Indonesia 2012). Therefore, universities and other tertiary providers have more government support to open bilingual or international programs, confirming that globalisation also affects educational provision (Gradoll 2000). However, limited research has been conducted in tertiary bilingual classrooms in Indonesia.

## Methods

This study investigated how and why Indonesian teachers made use of code-switching in a newly introduced bilingual program in Accountancy and Business Administration. The focus is on the pedagogical and sociocultural functions of teachers' code-switching, adopting a translanguaging perspective in the analysis.

### *Research design*

Canagarajah (2005) encourages researchers to conduct ethnographic studies into the everyday realities of students' and teachers' lives to come up with constructive suggestions for policy. This study therefore uses an ethnographic approach to examine how and why teachers shifted across languages in classrooms where both English and Bahasa Indonesia were used as the medium of instruction for Accountancy and Business Administration. Following Creswell's advice to provide multiple evidence over a prolonged time (2012, 480), data collection extended over one full semester and

combined classroom-based observation and recording of linguistic data with teacher reflections on their language choices and patterns of switching from one language to another. The study did not require transcription of prosodic and intonational contours; rather it required ethnographic detail of the classroom moments and conversational links, applying the principles of IS adapted to suit the research purpose and design.

***Research site and participants***

The research site was a bilingual program at a tertiary level State Polytechnic, in East Java, Indonesia. In this bilingual program English was intended as the main medium of instruction, but the classroom participants were still allowed to use Bahasa Indonesia. Since the weighting for English and Bahasa Indonesia was not explicitly stated in the policy, the choice was left up to the classroom participants. Teachers could make pedagogical choices according to their reading of the classroom interaction from moment to moment. Consequently, as Setati, Adler, Reed & Bapoo (2002) also suggest, teachers' competencies and skills, and their aspirations and perceptions about their learners, were of considerable importance.

The participant selection was done by sending the invitation letters to several bilingual teachers. Then, three of them who first made response were employed as the participants.Three teachers with three different classes were involved, a small sample suited to in-depth descriptive analysis of the object studied (Trotter 2012, 2). Teachers were chosen from volunteers who had sufficiently fluent English to avoid the possibility that their code-switching might be to cover weaknesses. One of them had recently obtained his PhD from a university in Australia, another had double degrees for her Masters from the same Australian university, and another was a PhD graduate from a university in Indonesia who obtained her masters and teaching certification from different universities in Australia. All were specialists in Accountancy or Business Administration and had mastered the academic language of their discipline in both English and Bahasa Indonesia. However, none of them had had any training in English language teaching, and their teaching goals and aspirations for their learners were oriented more towards content learning than English language learning.

### *Tools*

The study involved in-class observation with field notes and audio-and-video recordings, followed by semi-structured interviews, and a single focus group discussion (FGD). The classwork was multilingual, whereas the interview and FGD data was in Bahasa Indonesia, the language of greatest fluency for all participants. The study was conducted over one semester from July to December 2012 and involved 7-8 classroom sessions with each of the three teachers, sessions lasting between 60 and 90 minutes. The semi-structured interview with individual teachers included some stimulated recall, using the video as prompt to help them consider how they were performing a particular task (Gass & Mackey 2000, 17), and to revive their memories so that they might explain their actions and behaviours (Stough & Palmer 2003, 209). A Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was conducted as the closing data collection activity, since the synergistic effect of different participant perspectives tends to trigger expanded talk including personal experiences and previously unexplored ideas (Powell & Single 1996, 499).

### *Data analysis*

The analysis of classroom data was done by first reviewing all videos to select the sessions having a lot of code-switching. The examples of code-switching were then transcribed from the selected 15 sessions (see transcription convention in appendix A). Subsequently, by displaying all code-switching examples, it was possible to use IS combined with Ferguson's work to identify key features and interactive functions for switching out of English and switching back into English. Adopting a translanguaging perspective, a search was then made for instances where:

a) the code-switching was an intentional strategy to assist meaning making

b) the two languages worked together as a unity for achieving communication.

And where there was also potential for one or more of the following:

c) making meaning across cultures and/or across teacher/student identities

d) increasing students' understanding of the subject matter

e) increasing students' command of the less-known language.

These instances were then categorized in functional terms.

The analysis of interview data first involved transcribing from the audio recordings, which were then reduced by eliminating repetitive data. The data were then sorted based on the functional categories generated from the classroom data.

## Results and discussion

It should be emphasized that there were very few instances of teachers presenting the same information in both languages – rather, different languages were used for different purposes. The data analysis revealed that teachers' code-switching fell into four functional categories: the first three have been previously identified by Ferguson (2003; 2009) and the last is emergent from this study (Cahyani 2015) reflecting the local pedagogical and sociocultural context. The four functional categories are:

(1) **Knowledge construction:** including pedagogical scaffolding of content lessons, conceptual reinforcement, annotation of key second language (L2) technical terms, and review of a topic
(2) **Classroom management:** ranging from a topic shift/footing in lesson content to management of pupil behaviour such as developing self-awareness, gaining attention, and reprimanding/chiding
(3) **Interpersonal relations**: including indexing and negotiating different sociocultural identities, and humanising the classroom climate such as by giving praise and establishing rapport
(4) **Personal or affective meanings:** covering teachers' personal experiences, feelings and sociocultural functions such as saving face

In what follows, examples to illustrate these four categories are provided from the data, with some elaboration and discussion.

### *Teachers' code-switching for knowledge construction*

Teachers typically switched out of English into Bahasa Indonesia to ensure that students would understand their explanations more easily, bridging the knowledge gap as effectively and efficiently as they could. The following instance of single-word code-

switching directly connected a new concept (external capital) to students' local funds of knowledge (Moll 1992).

Extract 1

**T5**: … (talking about external capital). It can be from bank, it can be from investors, it can be from ((giving funny facial expression)) *rentenir*… whatever.

The word *rentenir* (*a loan shark*) refers to a person commonly found in a village who makes money by lending cash with an extreme interest rate, and can also be called *lintah darat* (*a blood sucker*), although the English terms are not semantically equivalent.

The teacher was clear about her reasons for switching to Bahasa Indonesia:

I use *rentenir* because they do understand in Indonesian context… I just could not find the translation of this word in English and there is no terminology *rentenir* in Accountancy (T5, stimulated recall).

In this instance, the teacher deliberately used a local word to ensure students' cognitive engagement (Heugh 2015), as indicated by the words 'because they do understand in Indonesian context'. Even had the teacher known the English terms, they are not common, and their use would neither have facilitated communication nor been valuable target language learning. By using a single Indonesian word in this way, within the English language explanation, the teacher was integrating the two languages in a powerful communicative unity, thereby translanguaging. Her act of translanguaging not only made the main concept clearer, but avoided spending time trying to explain a culturally familiar concept in culturally unfamiliar and marginally useful English. This echoes Manara's study (2007) in EFL university classrooms in Indonesia where teachers specifically used L1 with time-saving intention.

The next example of code-switching from English to Bahasa Indonesia refers to the foreign format required by the American computer software when entering dates, and was intended to help students construct knowledge by expanding on information.

Extract 2

**T4***:* So the first point, the first digit must be month; month, date and year. So just please pay attention to that data. Jadi nggak seperti di Indonesia ya: tanggal, bulan dan tahun (so it is not the same as in Indonesia: we have date, month and year).

The teacher then confirmed her reason for making this code-switching in the following excerpt:

It is related to the previous explanation that the students expected their screen to display something but the screen was blank. They made mistakes in entering the date in MYOB. Our system starts from date, month then year, while MYOB starts with month. Consequently, the journal cannot be displayed. I used English because the system was in English and I moved into Bahasa because I had to explain the important thing. (T4, stimulated recall)

The teacher affirmed that her code-switching was deliberately done to make students aware of the different rules of the date system in Indonesia, and to help them avoid repeating previous mistakes.

Yes, the pattern was actually simple but it was crucial. I moved from one language into another and went back again and again because I wanted to be flexible so that it would sound easy to the students who were listening (T4, stimulated recall).

From a language development perspective, it could be said that the expanded information was simple enough that it could more usefully have been given in English, and that if the teacher was in the habit of code-switching at this level, the students might not make the effort to understand the English explanations. However, this teacher's primary goal was to teach the subject matter, and she wanted to use the flexibility of code-switching to avoid students seeing it as complicated. It was a pedagogical decision based on her perception of the students and her content goal of teaching them to manage the software. Therefore this is a clear instance of intentional translanguaging.

***Teachers' code-switching for classroom management***

Teachers' code-switching for classroom management could be out of either English or Bahasa Indonesia, depending on the effect intended by the teacher. It took place most

frequently when teachers assigned tasks, signaled a shift of topic or activity, or disciplined students' behaviour. Signalling a shift or what Goffman called *footing* (1981, 128) refers to a change in the alignment or stance and a change in the frame of events. Both English and Bahasa Indonesia were employed for signalling a shift. However, the data for switching into English were found to be more widespread and varied, which might show teachers' preference in using English for that purpose.

The following example of a switch from English to Bahasa Indonesia occurred when T4 wanted to check students' understanding by asking what points they remembered from an earlier discussion.

Extract 3

**T4**: Do you still remember?.. Okay I will ask you a question ((looking at students' faces)).. ((waiting for students' response)). Kayaknya harus dipaksa ya? (*It seems that you need to be forced, yes?*) ((Picking up attendance list and calling out a student's name from it)).

Shifting into Bahasa Indonesia here functions as translanguaging in that the sentence is integrated with the previous English ones, and signals a shift from teaching mode to management mode by using disciplinary action to engage students, whilst simultaneously reducing social distance through the use of Bahasa Indonesia.

By contrast, social distance was increased in another translanguaging example, by switching out of Bahasa Indonesia into English and giving a clear signal of increased formality. T6 had been checking the students' attendance in Bahasa Indonesia and switched to English when a student who came late to the class approached to speak to him.

Extract 4

**T6**: Ada yang bawa absennya nggak hari ini?*(Has anyone brought the attendance list?)*

**Ss**: ((smiling and indicating that none brought the attendance list))

**T6**: Tidak ada? Oke. Nanti saja.*(None of you? Okay. Get it later.)* ((A student coming late from the door approaches the teacher to say something.)) Okay, good morning, you can sit.

**Sx**: ((did not say anything then turned to find an empty seat)).

In this case we see the teacher making a deliberate switch from simple management using Bahasa Indonesia into English to illustrate the seriousness of the situation and thus remind the students indirectly not to be late. The teacher stated his reason below:

I spoke in Bahasa to ask about 'absen' (*attendance list*) which is common in our class. I then switched into English when a student came late to make my language more formal. I did not use Bahasa to ask him because I wanted to make him more alert that we had started the class. (T6, stimulated recall)

This is an example of applying the concept of markedness (Myers-Scotton 1993) and also of preference-related code-switching (Auer 1988, 4), since the teacher intentionally code-switched when the situation called for immediate disciplining of the student.

In this study, teachers' code-switching to remind or warn students occurred in both languages. Teachers switched to Bahasa Indonesia when they wanted to make students be more active and responsive in the class (as in Extract 3). Meanwhile, they switched into English to warn students to be more careful in doing their assignments and to be more disciplined in class. This finding is different from Johnson's (1985) study, reported in Lin (2008; 2013), where Hong Kong teachers switched to L1 to address a serious and urgent matter such as disciplining a student.

Teachers' explanations for their choices of which language would work better in a particular classroom management situation indicate that their code-switching was not random but had meaning for them and was a representation of themselves as professionals. It reflects what Myers-Scotton (1993, 113) called a *negotiation principle*, requiring speakers to decide code choice according to a set of rights and obligations. Here the teachers' code-switching was a product of negotiation among their perceptions of participant rights and obligations within their Indonesian tertiary classrooms. This suggests the importance of both sociocultural and pedagogical context in understanding classroom translanguaging.

***Teachers' code-switching for interpersonal relations***

Teachers used code-switching for interpersonal relations to humanise the classroom – such as using humour, lightening the mood in order to reduce students' anxiety, and giving praise. These all demonstrate a connection between teacher and students in order to build a supportive classroom atmosphere, and also to show appreciation for students as people. In this paper, because of space constraints, examples will be given only for giving praise and being humorous.

While in Western cultures it is customary to give praise, this is not so in Eastern cultures, and Bahasa Indonesia does not lend itself to giving praise. Nevertheless, these teachers who had been educated in English speaking countries were influenced by the importance attributed there to giving praise, as suggested inT5's following interview excerpt with the researcher (R).

**R:** You gave praise to the students and admired their work using English. Why is it so?

**T5:** Mmmm..yes maybe because it's easier to do it in English. To me giving praise toward their good work is important and why I used English is because English is expressive.

**R:** Are you saying that English is expressive? Any other reasons?

**T5:** Well if I use Bahasa Indonesia, honestly I am not comfortable.

**R:** Why not comfortable? Does it sound made up?

**T5:** English uses praising words a lot, they use them, but we don't. […] If we give the praise in Bahasa Indonesia, it sounds not natural. (T5, stimulated recall).

Concluding with a cultural distinction between 'they' (native English speakers) and 'we' (Indonesians), this interview extract suggests that the teacher gave praise in English because she found it more sincere and socioculturally appropriate to use that language. An example of this is given in Extract 5 when T5 was delivering feedback on a group presentation. She gives glowing praise in English, switches into Bahasa to make a recommendation to other students, and then back into English to give further praise.

Extract 5

**T5**: Okay, well done! And I like your slides, it's very interesting slides and I hope eeh the next group will have a slide like these slides ((smiling and pointing her finger towards the PowerPoint slides)). Saya harapkan kalian bisa membuat slide seperti ini (*I hope you can make a slide like this*), It's very nice slide.

The use of the target language to give praise contrasts with Lin's (1996) study where Hong Kong teachers commended the students' work by switching to the L1, in this case Cantonese. In Lin's study, the teachers' intention was to establish a genuine and less distanced relationship with their students (Lin 1996, 67). If praise had been given in English, the students might have thought that teachers wanted to build social distance between them. This did not seem to be a factor for teachers in the present study, however, as they shifted into English to show the genuineness of the praise itself.

Humour is often a feature of interpersonal relations, and often requires switching into the speaker's most familiar language (e.g. Seidlitz 2003, 85). T6 loved using Javanese when he wanted to be humorous since it was his mother tongue, and he would also switch to Bahasa Indonesia to lighten the moment or treat the students informally. Here he switches from English to Bahasa to Javanese.

Extract 6

**T6**: ... that you have more international exposure than regular program. Just for example, some teachers speak English, like me sometimes I repeat it in Bahasa Indonesia just to clarify the idea. And rekan-rekan, selain dosennya seperti itu.. (*And, guys, it is not just the lecturers who should speak English*) Well actually not only the teacher has to speak English, it's supposed you to ask, make questions in English too. Jadi jangan hehheh Pak..((demonstrating one student pulling out his hand)) ditarik tanganku ((speaking in Javanese accent))(*So please don't pull on my hands if you want to ask a question.)*

Humour is not universal and it needs sufficient local knowledge and understanding to get the meaning. Here T6 was using humour to remind the students to behave politely with their teachers (following an earlier incident when a student grabbed his hand to ask for help at the computer). The teacher called the students *rekan-rekan* (*guys*) to position

them temporarily as peers, which also reflects how he built rapport with the students; similarly, he used the Javanese words *ditarik tanganku* to position himself alongside the students as insiders.

In interview, T6 said:

Being humorous using Javanese is easier for me to do. Also, it is much easier for the students and it can be used as ice-breaking strategy. (T6, interview)

Thus code-switching for humorous purposes can be seen as a strategic skill to make the classroom an enjoyable place for learning. Likewise, code-switching for giving praise can be taken as a bilingual teaching strategy which can be important for giving students powerful motivation, and for showing appreciation for their efforts to learn.

***Teachers' code-switching for expressing personal affective meanings***

Code-switching for expressing personal affective meanings concerns the teacher's own life experiences, feelings and psychological concerns. One example relating to reporting life experience occurred when T5 informed the class about her education background, in the first teaching session:

Extract 7

**T5**: … then I took my master degree in University oh sorry Curtin University of Technology, Perth, Australia. But S3 saya di disini Fakultas Ekonomi Brawijaya (*my doctoral degree was here in Economics faculty, Brawijaya University*).

T5 spoke English when talking about her Masters degree which she took in Australia, but she switched into Bahasa Indonesia when mentioning her doctoral degree which was in her homeland. The teacher seems to be influenced by her prior place-based experience, although her reasoning was not sought at the time of the interview.

In regard to feelings and psychological concerns, code-switching to save face was an important function, to avoid showing embarrassment to the students. The data below were recorded in the first session when T5 was about to introduce the topics for the semester and was uncomfortable because she had not brought the syllabus:

Extract 8

**T5**: Sorry today I didn't bring the syllabus for my subject. Maybe next week I will give you the syllabus… Saya akan berikan silabusnya untuk mata kuliah saya minggu depan yah (*I will give you the syllabus of the course next week*). Jadi apa yang kita pelajari semester ini (*so what are we learning this semester*)?

T5 intentionally switched into Bahasa Indonesia to assert more firmly that she would give out the syllabus the following week, and to move the students forward into thinking about the course content rather than her own negligence. It was easy for her to give a quick apology in English, but she avoided that in Bahasa Indonesia, where culturally an apology from teacher to students would have been inappropriate. This code-switching to L1 displays the teacher's authority; it represents a switching of role from a friendly apologetic English speaking identity into a dominant Indonesian speaking identity with traditional teacher-centred style. The shift reflects how bilinguals can feel different when switching from one language to another (Dewaele & Nakano 2013). It may be questioned whether or not this code-switching was for a pedagogical purpose, however we argue that it occurred as part of the teacher enacting her tasks and was integral to the classroom discourse, and is therefore indeed an instance of translanguaging.

Teachers' personal affective code-switching could be triggered by past experience and appears to be connected to speakers' subconscious and cognitive behaviour. This category differs from the interpersonal category in that it responds to personal factors more than audience factors. It includes 'spontaneous expression of emotions and emotional understanding in discourse with students' which Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult (1999, 65-66) give as their definition of code-switching for affective functions. Their data showed teachers switching to L1 to show sympathy to students and also anger. Flyman-Mattson and Burenhult's research (1999) only covered emotional matters whereas the present study suggests that teachers' code-switching could be influenced by speaking about prior experiences as well.

## Conclusions

The data presented here are illustrative of extensive corroborative data which confirm that, rather than merely reiterating information, the participating teachers typically had clear motivations for their code-switching and were engaged in active translanguaging. Since this practice might only naturally take place in a multilingual context, and not in a monolingual one (Canagarajah 2011, 8), it can be said that the teachers were able to take advantage of their multilingual context to extend their professional repertoire. Thus teachers in this study had the freedom to shuttle between languages, such as when they occasionally switched to Javanese when making humorous comments, shifted into English for giving praise or reprimanding students, and switched into Bahasa Indonesia to reinforce students' understanding.

The teachers' way of building rapport with the students also demonstrates pedagogical and sociocultural values, for instance the way T6 addressed the students using the Indonesian words *rekan-rekan* positioning them as peers or colleagues, which mirrors a collectivist perspective. Teachers' identities as both Javanese and Indonesian but also as educated scholars are embedded in their code-switching behaviour.

It is important to bear in mind that the goal of bilingual subject teaching is twofold, i.e. for content and also target language learning. This is in contrast to EFL classes, which are primarily focused on TL competence. Also, while in EFL classes students are required to master standard and everyday language, in bilingual subject teaching they are required to master the language of their chosen field, gaining conceptual competences in the appropriate language (Lin 2006, 301). Thus, code-switching in bilingual subject teaching may be somewhat different from that in an EFL program. Providing rich semantic context to facilitate students' bilingual subject learning especially for limited English proficiency students is essential (Lin 2006). We argue that providing rich semantic context is facilitated through teachers' integrated use of multiple languages.

This study emphasises the importance of translanguaging as a strategic use of code-switching, involving pedagogical and sociocultural functions designed to facilitate full communication and to engage students in the learning process. By not separating languages, but integrating them within a single clause, sentence or set of sentences,

teachers invite a fully multilingual construction of meaning, drawing on students' diverse cultural and linguistic resources for the sake of learning and engagement.

We argue that multilingual learning can be maximised when code-switching is done intentionally for pedagogical and sociocultural purposes. This is in contrast to the traditional sociolinguistic concept which sees code-switching as language interference, a sign of lacking ownership in a language, and associated with non-standard use of language (Canagarajah 2011, 2-3). This study suggests that teachers' translanguaging should be seen in a positive light, and as a demonstration of the speakers' multilingual communicative competence and their social accomplishment. As the data excerpts show, teachers' improvisation in switching between languages showed creativity in communication and served as a pragmatic multilingual strategy to support their pedagogy. The way the teachers use translanguaging to address differences in meaning across international business context also suggests a degree of transcultural competence. This concept has long been studied in the health sciences (Glover & Friedman 2015), but has only recently been attended to in language education (e.g. Kramsch 2010). Yet here we have seen Indonesian teachers clearly alerting students to 'differences in meaning, mentality, and worldview' (MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages 2007, 4), as in the example of loan sharks.

Teachers' multilingual communicative and transcultural competences are specifically indicated in this study by their ability to:

a) express their relationship to their personal past experience, through switching to the language of that experience;

b) express their membership of the local community by switching to the vernacular (Javanese) to make a joke;

c) demonstrate membership of the national and institutional community by switching to the national language (Bahasa Indonesia) to explain complex concepts, use culturally relevant examples, and discipline students; and

d) express professional authority by switching to the language of power in the bilingual program (English) to save face, discipline students and switch topics.

These four features of using multilingual and transcultural resources clearly indicate both social and pedagogical benefits, and thus a reason to foster their ongoing use.

## Recommendations

Multilingual teaching strategies integrating learners' home languages should be explored more fully, and research findings made public. Not enough practitioners know that home languages can help to maximise learning, build rapport, give support to students, and decrease student anxiety. Further research should investigate translanguaging practices in similar contexts to this study, i.e. where English is operating as a foreign language. It will be important to show how and why participants used multiple languages in the pedagogical process, and to incorporate student perspectives (see Cahyani 2015).

Finally, the present study indicates a need for institutional policy encouraging translanguaging as a pedagogical strategy for teaching in bilingual programs, and also providing training for bilingual teachers in the effective and efficient use of translanguaging. In turn, such training would need to build on research into students' use of code-switching for making sense of their learning within the content subject as well as in developing proficiency in the target language.

## Acknowledgement

We would like to thank the Indonesian government and the Directorate General of Higher Education (DIKTI), which sponsored this study, and the bilingual teachers for their willingness to be participants.

## References

Act of the Republic of Indonesia. 2003. *Number 20 Year 2003 on the National Education System*. Retrieved 24/01/2015 from http://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/upload/Indonesia/Indonesia_Education_Act.pdf.

Act of the Republic of Indonesia. 2012. *Number 12 Year 2012 on Higher Education*. Retrieved 22/07/2014 from http://www.iuli.ac.id/files/downloads/UU-012-2012-Pendidikan_Tinggi-English.pdf

Auer, P. 1988. A conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In *Code-switching: anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*, ed. M. Heller, 187-213. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baker, C. 2011. Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cahyani, Hilda. 2015. Code-switching in Indonesian tertiary bilingual classrooms: A deficiency or a strategy? PhD thesis. Adelaide: University of South Australia.

Canagarajah, S. 2005. Accommodating tensions in language-in-education policies: an afterword. In *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice*, ed. A.M. Lin & P.W. Martin, 194-201. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, S. 2011. Translanguaging in the classroom: emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review* 2: 1-28.

Cantone, K.F. 2007. *Code-switching in bilingual children*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. 2013. *Research methods in education*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.

Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. 2010. Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal* 94 (1): 103-115.

Creswell, J.W. 2012. Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. 4th Ed. Boston: Pearson Education Ltd.

Dewaele, J. M. & Nakano, S. 2013. Multilinguals' perceptions of feeling different when switching languages. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 34 (2): 107-120.

Ferguson, G. 2003. Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: functions, attitudes and policies. *AILA review* 16(1): 38-51.

Ferguson, G. 2009. What next? Towards an agenda for classroom code-switching research. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12 (2): 231-241.

Flyman-Mattsson, A. & Burenhult, N. 1999. Code-switching in second language teaching of French. *Lund Working Papers in Linguistics* 47: 59-72.

García, O. 2009. Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In *Social justice through multilingual education*, eds. T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A.K. Mohanty & M. Panda, 140-158. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

García, O. 2011a. Educating New York's bilingual children: constructing a future from the past. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 14 (2): 133-153.

García, O. 2011b.Theorising translanguaging for educators (1-7). In *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*, eds. C. Celic & K. Seltzer. NY: The City University of New York.

Gardner-Chloros, P. 2009. *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gass, S. M. & Mackey, A. 2000. *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research.* New Jersey: Taylor & Francis.

Glover, J. & Friedman, H. L. 2015. *Transcultural competence*: *navigating cultural differences in the global community.* Washington: American Psychological Association.

Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of talk.* Oxford: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Graddol, D. 2000. *The future of English*. London: The British Council.

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

Gumperz, J.J. 2008. Interactional sociolinguistics: A personal perspective. In *The handbook of discourse analysis*, eds. D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H.E. Hamilton, 215-228. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd Edn.). London: Edward Arnold.

Hamied, F.A. 2012. English in multicultural and multilingual Indonesian education. In *English as an international language in Asia: implications for language education*, eds. A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex, 63-78. New York: Springer.

Heugh, K. 2015. Epistemologies in multilingual education: translanguaging and genre–companions in conversation with policy and practice. *Language and Education 29* (3): 280-285.

Hornberger, N.H. & Link, H. 2012.Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: a biliteracy lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15 (3): 261-278.

Kirkpatrick, A. 2014. Afterword. In *Code-switching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives*, eds. R. Barnard & J. McLellan, 214-221. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Kramsch, C. 2010. Theorizing translingual and transcultural competence. In *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy*, eds. G.S. Levine & A. Phipps, 15–31. Boston: Heinle, Cengage Learning.

Levine, G.S. 2011. *Code choice in the language classroom.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lewis, G., Jones, B. & Baker, C. 2012. Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation* 18 (7): 641-654.

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

Lin, A. 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. 2008. Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. In *Encyclopedia of language and education*, eds. K. A. King & N. H. Hornberger, 273-286. Boston: Springer US.

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

Losey, K.M. 2009. Written code-switching in the classroom: can research resolve the tensions? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12 (2): 213-230.

Macaro, E. 2014. Where should we be going with classroom code switching research? In *Code-switching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives*, eds. R. Barnard & J. McLellan, 10-23. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Manara, M. 2007. The use of L1 support: teachers' and students' opinions and practices in an Indonesian context. *The Journal of Asia TEFL* 4 (1): 145-178.

Margana, M. 2013. Alih kode dalam proses pembelajaran bahasa Inggris di SMA. *LITERA*12 (01), 39-52.

Martin, P.W. 2005. 'Safe' language practices in two rural schools in Malaysia: tensions between policy and practice. In *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice*, eds. A.M. Lin & P.W. Martin, 74-97. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. 2007. *Foreign languages and higher education: new structures for a changed world.* Washington: Modern Language Association of America. Retrieved April 12, 2016, from http://www.mla.org/pdf/forlang_news_pdf.pdf

Modupeola, O. R. 2013. Code-switching as a teaching strategy: implications for English language teaching and learning in a multilingual society. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 14 (3): 92-94.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. 1992. Funds of knowledge for teaching: using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31: 132-141.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. Social motivations for code-switching: evidence from Africa. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Osman, S. 2012. Keeping English in Indonesian schools. *Jakarta Globe*, December 4. Retrieved 3/9/2012 from http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/archive/keeping-english-in-indonesian-schools/

Poplack, S. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Espanol: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18 (7-8): 581-618.

Rolin-Ianziti, J. & Brownlie, S. 2002. Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes* 58 (3): 402-426.

Seidlitz, L.M. 2003. *Functions of code-switching in classes of German as a foreign language* (Unpublished PhD thesis). The University of Texas.

Setati, M., Adler, J., Reed, Y. & Bapoo, A. 2002. Incomplete journeys: code-switching and other language practices in mathematics, science and English language classrooms in South Africa. *Language and education* 16 (2): 128-149.

Shin, S.J. 2005. Developing in two languages: Korean children in America. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Stough, L. M., & Palmer, D. J. 2003. Special thinking in special settings: a qualitative study of expert special educators. *The Journal of Special Education* 36 (4): 206-222.

Tannen, D. 1992. Sociolinguistics: interactional sociolinguistics. In *International encyclopedia of linguistics*, ed. W. Bright, 9-12, New York: Oxford University Press.

Tarone, E. & Swain, M. 1995.A sociolinguistic perspective on second language use in immersion classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal* 79 (2): 166-178.

Trotter, T.R. 2012. Qualitative research sample design and sample size: Resolving and unresolved issues and inferential imperatives. *Preventive Medicine* 55: 398-400.

Wang, L. & Kirkpatrick, A. 2013. Trilingual education in Hong Kong primary schools: a case study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 16 (1): 100-116.

Appendix A. Transcription convention, adapted from Dressler and Kreuz (2000) and Du Bois (1991)

| Code | Meaning |
|---|---|
| T | Teacher |
| S | Student |
| Ss | Students |
| .. | Pause |
| [] | Overlapping speech |
| ((behaviour)) | Paralinguistic behaviour: whispering, coughing, laughing |
| () | Unclear or unintelligible speech |
| Italics | Translated version |