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Abstract

Code-switching has been documented widely in the literature. The socio-cultural approach to the study of classroom interaction as described by Mercer (2000) is based on a detailed analysis of the discourse of language classrooms. Mercer identified various linguistic techniques used by teachers. I wanted to analyse trainee teachers’ beliefs about code-switching as a classroom practice. In the study, an examination of classroom practice was carried out with two bilingual Welsh English trainee teachers. Both trainees were observed and their teaching recorded. The trainees were also interviewed about their attitudes to the use of L1 in the L2 secondary English classroom. Both sequences and interviews were recorded in secondary schools in North Wales, where the language of the schools is predominantly Welsh. The data obtained was analysed using critical discourse analysis. The focus is on the extent to which the trainees have been able to make their teaching accessible to the bilingual pupils in their care. The instances where the teachers switched briefly from English into Welsh seemed to correspond to the functions of code-switching identified by Camilleri. The code-switching suggests a legitimate way of using shared language resources to scaffold pupils’ learning.

1. Introduction

This study focuses on interactions between trainee teachers and learners to develop an understanding of the process of teaching and learning in secondary bilingual classrooms in Wales and the role of language in that process. I focus on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to make an evaluative analysis of teaching and learning. The nature of teachers’ beliefs are also examined as they may have an influence in engaging and motivating bilingual students. The focus is on the extent to which trainee teachers have been able to ‘scaffold’ the learning for their students Mercer (2000).

2. Rationale

The study seeks to show how trainee teachers use code-switching as a pedagogic strategy and the reasons for this. A particular interest of the researcher is whether trainee teachers are aware of the positive benefits of
code-switching and to raise awareness of the sorts of relationships between language choice and wider social factors that trainee teachers need to be aware of. Ideally, this study will contribute to the debate on the use of translation as a natural and effective means of language teaching as well as a force for intercultural understanding (Cook, 2010).

2.1 The Welsh classroom context

According to Baker (2003:74), of those declaring themselves in the 1991 census as Welsh speaking, around 70% are literate in Welsh: In the 1991 Census, 18.7% reported themselves as Welsh speaking (No differentiation is made in the Census question between ability and use)’ (Baker 2003:74).

The Welsh-English classroom is an ideal setting for the study of code-switching as virtually all Welsh speakers are bilingual in Welsh and English. The results of the 2001 census show, for the first time, a slight increase in the proportion of Welsh speakers in Wales, to 21%. This change combined with increasing governmental support for the Welsh language suggests that we may now be entering a period of stable Welsh-English bilingualism for those who speak Welsh.

Currently there are several local education authorities encouraging education through the medium of Welsh:

‘20% of primary pupils are now taught in classes where Welsh is the medium of instruction for all or part of the day. In the secondary sector the number of schools designated as Welsh-speaking has increased from 44 to 53 since 1992 and 14% of pupils study Welsh as a first language’ (Welsh Assembly Government [WAG] 2003:38).

3. Literature review

This section is divided into three parts and consists of a review of the three core concepts relevant to discourse in bilingual settings. They are pedagogy, code-switching and critical discourse analysis.

According to Block (2003) it is through developing ways of working in which teachers’ aims and concerns are clearly appreciated by researchers, that educational researchers are most likely to be able to make a valuable contribution to the improvement of educational practice.

Block refers to an article by Prahbu (1992), which offers a conceptual model for this. Prahbu suggests that a lesson can usefully be considered as two different kinds of event: as a pedagogic event and as a social event. There may be conflict between the pedagogic and social aspects of a language lesson:

‘A recommended teaching procedure may incorporate the principle that learners’ efforts should precede the teachers’ input,
such that much of the learning takes place as a form of discovery by the learner, and the teacher’s input is responsive to the learner’s effort, rather than preemptive of it. But the classroom lesson as a social genre, often includes the notion that it is part of the teacher’s role to provide the necessary inputs and that it is therefore unfair or incompetent of the teacher to demand effort by learners in the absence of such inputs’ (Prahbu, 1992: 230).

The main conclusion that Prahbu highlights from this analysis is that teachers need to become more aware of how pedagogic factors, such as teachers’ methodological choices and aspects of curriculum design, interact with social factors, such as power relations between teachers and students, the dynamic interpersonal relationships in learner working groups and the implicit assumptions that both teachers and learners make about how the process of teaching and learning should be carried out.

3.1 Pedagogy

From Vygotsky (1978), we have the notion of language serving two functions: as a psychological tool and a cultural tool. As a psychological tool, we use language not just as a classification system for organizing our thoughts, but also for reasoning, planning and reviewing.

Our use of language as a cultural tool involves us in a two-way process of constant change. ‘Culture’ is the joint knowledge available to members of social activity. We use language as a way of making things happen, by influencing the actions of others. Many researchers have moved towards a constructivist approach to the study of educational talk, focusing on the function of dialogue: ‘language is treated as the site of action rather than the tool for transmitting information from the teacher’s to the pupils’ minds.’ (Benwell and Stokoe (2002:430). Halliday (1993) also describes the Vygotskyan conception of the role of language in education by suggesting that ‘When children learn language…they are learning the foundations of learning itself’ (Halliday, 1993:3).

3.2 Code-switching in the bilingual classroom

According to Myers-Scotton (1993:1) ‘Code-switching is a term used to identify alternations of linguistic varieties within the same conversation.’ Utterances containing code-switching contain the same discourse unity as utterances in one linguistic variety alone. For example, if the code-switching is within a single sentence, the elements from the two different languages generally are joined together.

Researchers have attempted to determine the extent to which the use of two languages in the same conversation follows a predictable pattern, or is random behaviour. Poplack (1980) proposed that code-switching was subject to two main constraints, the equivalence and the free-morpheme constraint. Following the discovery of many counter-examples, Myers-Scotton (1993, 2002) proposed an alternative model of code-switching based on the
recognition of an asymmetrical relationship between the two languages in a speech community, such that one was the “matrix” or base language while the other was the “embedded language”. Codeswitched material may be intersentential or intrasentential. Intersentential code-switching involves switches from one language to the other between sentences. Intrasentential switches occur within the same sentence, from single-morpheme to clause level.

Auer (1984;1990) looks at code-switching within a conversation analysis framework and makes use of some of Gumperz’s ideas. Auer seems to see individual interactions generating the social meaning of code choices. He writes (1990: 780):

‘To give an example: if German is habitually used by Italian children in Germany for conversational activities such as joking, innuendo, side remarks, evaluations and assessments, whereas Italian is not, then this conversational usage will both construe and display the values associated with German (e.g. ‘peer language’) The interpretation of such code alternation is not imported from the outside, it is built up in the conversation itself, and on the basis of similar cases in the co-participants’ experience.’

Howard Giles (1991) has used speech accommodation theory to explain the social motivations for code-switching. Speech accommodation theory is used to explain why speakers shift their speech in different interactions with others. Giles suggests that speakers desire their listeners’ social approval, and use modification of their speech towards the listeners’ code as a tactic to obtain this approval. According to Auer (1998:3) neither the socio-linguistic approach nor the grammatical approach explores the whole range of observed regularities in bilingual speech.

3.3 Critical discourse analysis

Previous approaches to discourse analysis have been based on the assumption that language is part of social life: “dialectically interconnected with other elements of social life, so that social analysis and research always has to take account of language. (Fairclough, 2003:2). For the purposes of this study the writer’s aim was to explore discourse at a macro level, focusing on negotiation of meaning and power relations between interlocutors. Fairclough (2003:3) presents the key tenets of discourse analysis, pointing out the essentials as ‘oscillating’ between a focus on specific texts and a focus on what he terms the ‘order of discourse’ (Fairclough 2003:3).

4. Methodology (Critical Discourse Analysis) and procedures

The goal of this study is to answer the research question:
What do bilingual teachers gain by conducting a conversation in two languages (i.e. through code-switching) rather than simply using one language throughout?

The research was divided into two main parts. The first part comprised the classroom study, designed to answer the research question:

How do teachers employ code-switching as a teaching strategy and what are their reasons for doing so?

The second part was designed to answer the question:

Where do teachers’ beliefs re code-switching come from?

As teachers, we are constantly making decisions about what to teach and the best vehicle for communicating our ideas effectively to students. I chose to focus on trainee teachers as I felt that this was an interesting channel to explore how code-switching is perceived in the classroom. Trainee teachers are a particularly interesting group to study as their pedagogical principles are more ‘fluid’ : less ingrained than highly experienced teachers.

**Investigating dual language teaching**

Canagarajah (1999) argues that despite several decades of English-only policy for second language classrooms, ‘alternative perspectives and research on the role of L1 are now emerging. From being considered an obstacle to mastering a second language, it is now argued that L1 can actively promote more effective acquisition of L2 ’ Canagarajah (1999: 128).

Auerbach (1993) also suggests a role for L1 (language 1) in reducing the degree of language stress and culture shock, thus increasing openness to learning English. Further more Cummins’s (1991) linguistic interdependence principle explains that proficiency in L1 can enhance competence in L2 (language 2) by activating a common underlying proficiency that enables cognitive/academic and literacy-related skills to transfer across languages. Insisting that the provision of the mother-tongue in the educational process is a fundamental ‘linguistic human right’, Skutnabb-Kangas (1990) invokes UNESCO’s call for all linguistic minorities to be guaranteed the right to the active use of L1 in early schooling in all classrooms.

**4.1 The Study**

This study investigates the discourse practices of a range of trainee teachers in terms of their awareness of the positive value of bilingual teaching methods. It was decided to focus on trainee teachers as their beliefs are more fluid in terms of having a finite toolkit of teaching skills. All of the Secondary PGCE trainee teachers (200) completed an initial questionnaire aimed to find out their beliefs about the role of the L1 in the bilingual classroom and it was decided to investigate these beliefs further in terms of their awareness of the
positive benefits of bilingual teaching though a ‘mixed-methods’ approach. Five trainees were initially selected for observations and two of these were observed and subsequent follow-up interviews were conducted using structured questions. Trainee teachers were chosen because they ‘appeared to have different approaches and reactions to the issue of L1 use.’ (Macaro 2001:537) The classroom observation of two lessons were analysed to examine the language choices of the teachers from a Systemic Functional Linguistic perspective.

4.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is an approach to language analysis, which concerns itself with issues of language, power and ideology. One of its main aims is to highlight how language serves to construct particular ideological positions which entail unequal relations of power. CDA has been referred to as ‘discourse analysis with an attitude’ (Van Dijk 2001:96). It has been used to examine spoken language as well as written discourse. It involves the social analysis of discourse (Fairclough & Wodak 1997). Recent versions of CDA have the objective of giving an account of the ways in which and the extent to which social changes are changes in discourse. Fairclough (1995:219) states:

The issue of language and power in education is just part of the more general social problematic of language and power, and ought not in my view to be isolated from it. At least in the developed capitalist countries, we live in an age in which power is predominantly exercised through the generation of consent rather than through coercion, through ideology rather than through physical force, through incultation of self disciplining practices rather than through the breaking of skulls....Part of his development is an enhanced role for language in the exercise of power: it is mainly in discourse that consent is achieved, ideologies are transmitted, and practices, meanings, values and identities are taught and learnt’ (cited in Coffin, 2001:99).

CDA does not theorise about language as a system. Rather, drawing on social theorists such as Foucault (1979, 1980) the focus is on ‘orders of discourse’. ‘Orders of discourse’ refers to the different ways of talking or writing which occur in particular institutional settings, such as school, prison or family. Each order of discourse is made up of ‘discourse types’. In a school, for example, discourse types would include teacher-to–student talk, school authorities’ communication with teachers, playground talk and the specialized language of different curriculum areas. Often the framework for systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is used as a means of identifying and distinguishing discourse types. CDA has been found to be a beneficial tool in a range of TESOL contexts around the world.

CDA is distinctive in that it is a form of ‘explanatory critique’ Bhaskar (1986) cited in Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999:33) i.e. CDA takes the form of
‘showing (a) a problem, which may either be cognitive, for example, a misrepresentation, or an unmet need...(b) what obstacles there are to it being tackled...(c) what function (including ideological function) of the misrepresentation or unmet need is in sustaining existing social arrangements; and (d) possible ways of removing the obstacles. The two types of problem point to two aspects of CDA: one a form of transitive critique of discursive dimensions of practices in terms of whether they meet or fail to meet the communicative aspects of the needs of people engaged in the practices.’

Theoretically, this approach is characterized by the realist social ontology, which regards both abstract social structures and concrete social events as part of social reality. Clark and Ivanic, have incorporated critical language awareness (CLA) into courses on academic writing (1997). The insights from discourse analysis for spoken texts is relatively new, where the focus is on examining natural and extended samples of spoken language. Fairclough (1995) outlines the procedure:

A piece of discourse is embedded within socio-cultural practice at a number of levels; in the immediate situation, in the wider institution or organization, and at a societal level; for example, one can read an interaction between marital partners in terms of their particular relationship, relationships between partners within the family as an institution, or gender relationships in the larger society. The method of discourse analysis includes linguistic description of the language text, interpretation of the relationship between the (productive and interpretation) discursive processes and the text, and explanation of the relationship between the discursive processes and the social processes (Fairclough, 1995: 97, cited in Thomas, 2009: 205).

4.3 Methods

The researcher uses CDA to identify how the discourse practices of 2 teachers would affect the learning of their students. The sample reflected a range of schools in terms of the economic advantage of the catchment area. Observations and semi-structured interviews were conducted in 3 schools. The data was collected during a single visit to each of the schools. In accordance with ethical guidelines provided by the university, the participants were assured that they could withdraw from the research at any time and that the observation of lessons was not for assessment purposes. The audio data was transcribed. Initial coding was done by hand, resulting in a selection of extracts for micro-analysis on the basis of their relevance to the research question. Other themes emerged as the analysis progressed. The trainee teachers were asked to take part in an individual interview with the researcher, using a schedule of questions related to the research as prompts.

The lessons selected for analysis are very different and the trainees’ beliefs about the role of L1 varied considerably in the subsequent interviews. Both
lessons were English lessons with different outcomes involving practical group work. The first lesson (taught by DT) involves preparation of a year 9 class for blog writing to develop drafting skills. The researcher has chosen the beginning of each lesson to capture the talk used by the teacher to explain the task. The second lesson (taught by PSJ) involves year 9 in preparation for a spelling test using various spelling strategies to help the pupils memorize key words.

Extracts from the two lessons are analysed using CDA to indicate the ways in which discourse practices were likely to enhance access to understanding English for the pupils and how these teachers in their interviews analysed their ‘role’ when questioned.

The transcription of the classroom teaching may be analysed in terms of Field, Tenor and Mode (Halliday, 1985:12)

- **Field** is the topic of the social activity taking place.
- **Tenor** is the relationships between participants, the status and roles of the participants.
- **Mode** is the kind of text being created, for example, spoken or written.

Both lessons were English lessons. Both lessons were analysed using CDA to indicate how these texts show particular beliefs about the role of L1 in the L2 classroom. The focus will be mainly on the ‘mode’, which Halliday (1985:12) refers to as: ‘the symbolic organization of the text, rhetorical modes (persuasive, expository, didactic etc); the channel of communication, such as spoken/written, monologic, dialogic, visual contact.’ The analysis comprises of 3 stages: description, explanation and interpretation (Fairclough 1989).

5. Results: Comparing the discourse practices of teacher A (DT) and Teacher B (PSJ) and their tolerance of code-switching.

5.1 Example 1: Teacher A (DT)

DT is a secondary trainee English teacher undergoing school experience at a bilingual school. Most of her education has been through the medium of Welsh apart from her degree. The class I observed was a year 9 set I English class in a bilingual comprehensive school in a coastal town in North Wales. The class was working through a writing project, which involved use of ICT for blog writing. DT was very apprehensive about being observed and kept the use of Welsh to a minimum. The lesson was very well planned, although the introduction left little room for discussion and was quite didactic. The class was given examples of blogs to compare and evaluate, but much of the feedback was orchestrated by the trainee with little room for a creative response until they were encouraged to write their own versions. The session concludes with the trainee reminding the class about the homework and stressing the inclusion of images and IT software. The trainee's age and
training and her own school experience and family language background may have some bearing on her choice of language as a medium of instruction. (Camilleri: 1996:93)

I consider extracts from the lesson in terms of 3 elements: classroom management; lesson content and language socialization (Canagarajah, 1999: 131).

**Classroom management**

In relation to classroom management the first aspect to notice is the use of imperatives and modality:

**Sample 1: extract 1 DT (March 2010)**

36 (Classroom noise) OK Excuse me – (calling for attention) Ssh! I think you need to spend five minutes discussing with your group just to make sure you know exactly what you’re going to be writing. I’ll give you five minutes discussion and then I want you to move back to your places to write your own blog entry OK? And then you go back to your own groups at the end to discuss them ok so a quick five minutes.

The lesson is very ‘business like’ in terms of setting up activities, providing a model of the type of writing required and then introducing the homework. There is a distinct absence of facilitative language to check understanding and the plenary section appears to be rushed. There are politeness markers e.g. ‘excuse me’ (sample 1, extract 1, line 36) but these appear to be linked to abrupt instructions. The focus is on efficiency and short exchanges with the class.

Code-switching is avoided almost completely; which would seem to invalidate the purpose of the observation. However, when examining the interview data it appears that there is a reason for the omission of any use of Welsh. The rationale for using English only is referred to by DT as:

‘ trying to get them to speak English... for their oral English.. for their oral group work they conduct it in Welsh... so I’m very aware of it...trying to get them to speak in English. Generally when they do individual oral work they’ll speak English, but it would improve their English if they were able to do it in group work as well... but for the pupils it’s not natural. I was the same when I was at school...’ (interview sample 1, line 7)

**Lesson content**

We also considered how the use of L1 was motivated by cognitive considerations to help in the transmission of the lesson’s academic content.
The conventional code for explicit instruction in the classroom was understood as English, but as suggested the pupils unconsciously switched to Welsh to clarify definitions and uncertainties (sample 1 extract 2, lines 3-5). Indeed the only instance of code-switching instigated by teacher A occurs when monitoring group work towards the end of the lesson:

Sample 1 Extract 2 Classroom observation Year 9 DT (March 2010)

01 (noise) T(1): Does each group need more time to discuss?
02 Do you know what you’re doing?
03 Pupil C(2): Roeddwn i’n meddwl ei fod ni fod i sgwennu efo nhw.
04 (I thought we were supposed to write with them)
05 Teacher (3): Fusa ti’n gallu sgwennu (..)
06 Mae o digon hawdd. Dim efo (****) software. Mae na dau ‘b’ yn
07 ‘pebble’. (You could write.. It’ easy enough. Not with (****) software.
08 There are two ‘b’s in ‘pebble (checking grammar)
09 Pupil D(4): Sgwennu fi ydy hwnna. (That’s my writing!)
10 Teacher (5): Ok quiet. When everyone’s quiet I want to say one more
11 thing. Thank you Ssh! right You’ve worked very well. Some of theses
12 blogs are very good. They’re going to look good once you get all the
13 images so if you want, if you’ve got any images that you want to scan
14 or anything bring a USB stick or this group they’re going to make
15 sounds clips .. OK
16 thank you. (class dismissed).

The instance of code-switching serves two purposes (1) to reassure that the task is straightforward (sample 1, extract 2, line 6) and (2) to correct spelling/grammar (sample 1, extract 2, lines 6-8). There is less of a tendency to elaborate and probe the answers given. The instances of IRF (Initiation, feedback, response) (sample 1, extract 2, lines 1-8) exchange serve to highlight the teacher’s role as controller of the learning.

Language socialization

It was evident from the classroom observation of teacher A’s lesson that she encouraged pupils to complete classroom routines solely in English. It was interesting to note that pupils were using Welsh for interactions that are considered ‘personal’ or ‘unofficial’(sample 1, extract 2, line 9). By ‘language socialization’ we are referring to the process of language learning as socialization into the language practices of the bilingual class and the wider host community. In accordance with similar findings by Canagarajah (1999:141) ‘English emerges as a code that symbolizes impersonality, formality, detachment and alienation’ (sample 1, extract 2, lines 10-15). Code-switching indicates how pupils manage both their identities i.e. classroom discourse community versus Welsh vernacular community.

5.2 Example 2: Teacher B

Teacher B, PSJ, is a mature student with several years working in industry. She was on school placement at a bilingual comprehensive school in a
quarrying village in North Wales. She networked very well with the pupils and I was impressed by her knowledge of them as individuals. Her voice was clear and she articulated well. Her Year 8 class was mixed ability.

PSJ was using this lesson as an opportunity to revise spelling and test pupils’ memorization of frequently used vocabulary. The lesson was structured carefully, but there were opportunities for explanation, concept checking and re-iteration. Her use of pronouns was more personal and she used humour successfully to clarify teaching points.

**Classroom management**

She used questions frequently to manage the learning and check cooperation:

(‘while you’re getting these pieces of paper what should you be looking at?’ (sample 2, extract 1, lines 7-8). The first instance of code-switching occurs early on to manage behaviour very swiftly:

**Sample 2 Extract 1. Classroom observation Year 8 PSJ (March 2010)**

01 Teacher (1): Classwork and today’s date.
02 Student (2): What’s the date?
03 Teacher (3): Twenty sixth of March. Hurry up Nathan please. Learning objectives. What did we do yesterday?
04 Student (4): Spelling
05 Teacher (5) Yes what else Freya?
06 You can write this (writing on the board) While you’re getting these pieces of paper what should you be looking at?
07 Wnewch chi weld fi ar diweddd y wers ?( Can you see me after the lesson ?)

The switch to Welsh (sample 2, extract 1, line 9) has immediate impact and demands attention! The teacher defines English as the formal discourse and the L1 as the discourse of solidarity. The teacher is stepping out of the routine. Later on she adds : ‘Be sy’n bod fan hyn ar y bwrdd canol yma’ (what is wrong over here on this middle table) to indicate that she is well aware of who is misbehaving and that she has not missed anything.

**Lesson content**

Conversely PSJ uses many informal terms and metaphors to clarify and ‘magnify’ meaning:

**Sample 2, Extract 2 Classroom observation Year 8 PSJ (March 2010)**

01 (Noise)Teacher (1) : Ok let’s have a look (explaining spellings to pupil)
02 (To class) teacher(2): Ok we’ll just go over some spellings quickly.
03 Necessary, I think Never Eat Salad Sandwiches and Remain Young.
04 Well done brilliant. Diolch yn fawr (Thank you very much)
05 Teacher (3) Any other words?
Note that praise is reinforced in Welsh: (‘ Diolch yn fawr’ : ‘thank you very much’) (sample 2, extract 2, line 4). The teacher is probably switching to Welsh to draw on learning in the L1 to clarify meaning in the L2. She highlights new information by activating prior learning as well as conveying a relationship between ideas, a kind of phonetic ‘inter-textuality’ which encourages the pupils to make connections between their L1 phonology and L2 spelling (sample 2, extract 2, lines 3-15). The first example is quite misleading, but eventually the pupils get the grasp of it and think up their own mnemonics to facilitate learning. For this strategy to work the teacher has to assume that pupils have competence in both languages. Interestingly, the language choices involve a mode of address which is almost an extension of family, parent-child talk:

Teacher: (1) This is a test . so what do I expect. Silence. Are we ready? No. Are we ready now? Goodness gracious me what are you doing over there you’re writing a novel. Are you ready? (Sample 2 , extract 3).

Language socialization

There are instances of intra-sentential switches:

‘I’d like you to swop drosodd efo ffrindiau’ (swop over with friends)

The Welsh is a base into which English is appropriated. Here the teacher uses Welsh to personalize interactions and establish rapport very skillfully with the pupils.

‘Tell me which one is next: Occasion. Sian gest ti hwnna’n iawn? Lovely idea from Lucy… (‘Sian did you get that one correct?’)

Key spellings were articulated carefully ensuring that pupils were able to hear the correct pronunciation. There was also evidence of positive reinforcement and praise ‘Ardderchog’ (excellent) I’m so proud of you’ and egalitarian modes of operating: ‘seriously girls – you’re the only ones not sticking to the rules and everyone else is..un munud ar ol’ (‘one minute left.’ ) Teacher B seemed more self-assured in her ability to engage the learners and employ the dynamic use of L1 to facilitate learning. Her teaching experiences, as
recounted in her follow up interview, encouraged her to see the positive value in the process of code-switching in the classroom. She maintained a belief that there was a specific role for L1 in order to ensure comprehension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field – the topic or activity</th>
<th>Language choices in relation to Field</th>
<th>Language Choices in relation to Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text A</td>
<td>Field – English lesson General introduction to blog writing</td>
<td>Field – English lesson Revision of spellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text B</td>
<td>Language choices</td>
<td>Language choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Largely didactic</td>
<td>• exploratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instructions</td>
<td>• discussion of spelling strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoidance of code-switching minimal use of Welsh</td>
<td>• use of code-switching to magnify + enhance/understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor – the relationship between the interactants</th>
<th>Interpersonal analysis: language choice in relation to Tenor</th>
<th>Interpersonal analysis: language choice in relation to Tenor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text A</td>
<td>Tenor – teacher less powerful, less assertive</td>
<td>Tenor – teacher more powerful, assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text B</td>
<td>Language choices</td>
<td>Language choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mode of address based on politeness ie ‘please will you’</td>
<td>• Mode of address extension of family talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attitude expressed through inflection</td>
<td>• Attitude to Welsh emphasized through intensified lexis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modality – ‘should’ ‘you may’</td>
<td>• absolutely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information given answering the questions short</td>
<td>• No modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>response time</td>
<td>• Focus on We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Demands for action realized as interrogative ‘Would you please’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode – the mode of communication</th>
<th>Textual analysis: language choices in relation to Mode</th>
<th>Textual analysis: language choices in relation to Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text A</td>
<td>Mode – more monologic</td>
<td>Mode more abstract concepts included e.g. visualization of spelling strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text B</td>
<td>Language choices</td>
<td>Language choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No nominalization</td>
<td>• Nominalisations, often in theme position, summarizing previous information, creating cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Themes often ‘I’ rather than highlighting action</td>
<td>• Conjunctions contribute to reasoning and cohesion of text. E.g. therefore, in order to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Referencing unclear e.g., b h this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Little use of conjunctions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Application of CDA framework; Analysis of discourse practices A and B

5.3 Summary

Table 1 summarizes both teachers’ discourse practices. In terms of ‘tenor’, relationships, the student teacher in text B is more comfortable with familiar talk. The mode of address is an extension of family.
The analysis provides us with the basis for understanding these discourse practices. Text A was considered less exploratory, avoiding the use of code-switching, than B, partly because of the way the trainee structured the lesson. In terms of ‘field’, text A relies on largely didactic language choices and text B allows open discussion.

In terms of ‘tenor’ relationships, the student teacher in text B is more comfortable with familiar talk. The mode of address is an extension of family talk. This teacher remains more assertive and powerful. There is a strong emphasis on collaborative talk in text B, whereas text A indicates that the speaker is less assertive, and modes of address are based on ‘politeness.’

In relation to ‘mode’, Text B makes more use of nominalization than text A. It would be interesting to note to what extent this analysis can be used to prove the relationship between context, text and language choice.

Discussion

The most important aspect highlighted in this study is that there is a marked difference between the trainee teachers’ confidence and awareness of the use of code-switching in the secondary classroom. The two different discourse practices and the data from follow-up interviews with both teachers A and B suggest two very opposing pedagogical positions.

6.1 Beliefs about code-switching

Code-switching was regarded in different ways by both teachers. This was indicated strongly in the interviews, by the ways they operated in the classroom and the status given to English.

In example 1, Welsh is only used once to clarify and check understanding. The English lesson is represented as being an opportunity to practice L2 rather than build on cognitive and academic proficiency in L1 (Cummins). In example 2 Welsh is employed to magnify the teaching point, to reduce anxiety and indicate solidarity with the pupils as they navigate the complex intersection between their various codes. For teacher B, code-switching is a natural extension of social communication which all bilinguals experience. The code-switching exhibited in example 2 indicates how various identities are managed. Teacher B reduces or heightens her power difference by moving in and out of Welsh. According to Canagarajah (1999:142): ‘the ESL class becomes a site for the skillful negotiation of identities, roles values and group membership - which is a complex discursive strategy used in everyday life by competent bilingual speakers.’

Accommodation of L1 in acquiring English also helps in cognitive processes such as bridging the structural distance between disparate systems, reducing cognitive dissonance and enriching the expressive and referential resources of the L2 in terms of local contextual conditions (Sridhar 1994: 802-803).
7. Implications of the study for training

By conducting this study I have been made aware of the need to encourage students to reflect on the dynamic use of both languages in the classroom. Future teacher training programmes need to consider how L1 can be pedagogically sustained to enhance critical language awareness and cultural enrichment. Macaro (2001:545) comments on the range in both quantity and functional use of L1. We need to establish principles for code-switching by understanding its functions and its use as an educational tool. Kumaravadivelu’s (1999) emphasis on conceptualizing critical classroom discourse analysis, draws attention to the analysis of multiple perspectives based on the premise that ‘language teachers can ill afford to ignore the social-cultural reality that influences identity formation in and outside the classroom, nor can they afford to separate learners’ linguistic needs and wants from their social needs and wants’ (Kumaravadivelu’s, 1999:472).

7.1 Limitations of the study

It is worth emphasizing that there are some limitations of the CDA framework as an analysis of linguistic choices. Firstly, due to the size of the sample, the findings of this study cannot be generalized indiscriminately, but rather should be taken as a pilot study. Secondly, more measures of the level of support for use of L1 would have strengthened the study. Indeed it would be interesting to examine how the lesson unit relates to larger structures of experience. Some of the issues raised in the discussion echo other findings in other international studies.

7.2 Concluding remarks

The main implication of this study has been to show how CDA can offer a framework for analysing trainee teachers’ code-switching in the bilingual classroom. The data suggests that trainees’ beliefs about the role of code-switching are not based on policy but on a interactional relations: the shifting negotiation of identity between teacher and pupils. Interestingly, accommodation of L1 in English classes does not hamper the acquisition of L2, but enhances it (Martin-Jones and Heller, 1996).

The use of Critical Discourse Analysis remains a powerful tool for raising awareness of the power relations within the bilingual teaching situation. The potential for teachers to ‘scaffold’ the learning is enormous.
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