CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1   Introduction

This chapter presents the previous research or studies that are related to the current study. The previous research discussed here is associated with code switching and its functions, inter-gender involvement in code switching and studies that look at speech acts and code switching among L2 learners.

2.2   Code switching in bilingual and foreign language classes

People begin to communicate information through a variety of speech register and style switching in languages and conversations. Of particular interest to sociolinguistic and developmental researchers, is the impressive ability of bilingual speakers to switch with ease at different points in conversation.

The education community has paid little attention to the simultaneous development of the two languages in bilingual learners. In particular, bilingual learners mixing of languages in the process of language acquisition has been viewed unfavourably by the mainstream society, and it has been "the least systematically studied" (Romaine, 1989).

2.2.1   Definition of code switching

Code-switching has been defined in various ways. As quoted in Soh (1984), Haugen (1956) said it is the alternative use of two languages. As quoted in Soh (1984), Ervin-Tripp (1964) limits it - perhaps overly so - to just, stylistic alternation when a speaker changes his speech stylistically to suit different social roles. This implies the use of just one language. Gumperz (1982) classifies code-switching into three varieties. He concentrates on conversational code-switching and defines it as the juxtaposition within

the same speech exchange of passages of speech. This will be the definition adopted for this study which will seek to illustrate inter-gender code-switching among upper primary learners during peer conversation in Malaysia.

It is logical that code switching can only exist in societies which are at least bilingual. Such societies must be linguistically, if not ethnically, heterogeneous and the members of these societies are defined as the 'multilingual in a variety of languages or dialects that are functionally differentiated....' (Kuo, 1985). Due to historical and economic reasons, most South-East Asian countries fit this description. Malaysia, for example, has a sole national language, Bahasa Malaysia, with second language, English, and a multitude of ethnic languages, chief among which are the Malay dialects, Hokkien, Cantonese and Tamil. Thus, linguistically Malaysia represents what Rustow (1968) describes as a language pattern involving 'a variety of unrelated languages each with its own literary tradition'; and what Fishman (1972) designates as a 'multimodal nation' which is suitable for this study.

Fallis (1978) reveals that the term "code switching" is also known as "code alternation". This refers to the alternation of two languages at the word, phrase, clause or sentence level. It involves introducing into the context of one language, stretches of speech that exhibit the other language phonological features. On the other hand, Gumperz (1982:59) says that code switching is the juxtaposition within the same speech format exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems.

2.2.2 Functions of Code Switching

Numerous studies have addressed the question of the role of learners' first language in bilingual and foreign language classes. Jacobson (1981) describes traditional bilingual methodology in the United States that assumed that the two languages being learned would or should be kept separate, whether on the basis of speaker (e.g., having different teachers speak different languages to the learners), subject matter, time or place.

Despite this traditional assumption of the separation of languages, both languages can also be used at the same time, following different patterns, or switching between the two can be random, following no principled rules (Jacobson 1990). In this approach, teachers must monitor their language use in order to ensure that language alternation achieves pedagogically sound objectives and that switches occur in response to specific linguistic, educational and social cues which falls into four categories. The classroom strategies include review of material, students' attention and praise. Second, switches due to curricular cues help to maintain appropriate language use. Third, teachers are switching in response to language development and finally due to the interpersonal relationship to establish intimate or formal tones.

Zentella (1981) similarly studies bilingual education in the U.S., although she describes not ideal, codified practices but observed patterns of behaviour. Her data confirm previous studies that suggest that bilinguals older than five years old tended to respond in the language in which they were addressed; however, she suggests that older children may also speak their own preferred language if they know that their interlocutors share that language. Overall, she suggests that teachers' language choices had a clear effect on learners' language use. This study focuses mainly on the influence of interlocutors'

language choice and personal characteristics on bilingual classroom code switching patterns.

In contrast, other studies of classroom code switching have focused on the functions performed by different languages. For example, Piasecka (1988) suggests that the use of students' native language in ESL classes in Poland should be a joint decision between teachers and students where when the teachers and pupils share a linguistic background, there can be closer understanding between them because teachers can better understand learners' difficulties than would someone from a different background (Piasecka 1997).

Two studies by Polio and Duff (1990,1994) examined both quantitatively and qualitatively the use of English and the foreign language in university foreign language classes in the U.S. The 1990 study measured the relative amounts of English and the target language spoken in thirteen various level language classes. Despite having controlled many variables—for example, all instructors were native speakers of the languages they taught, there was great variation among teachers in the amount of the target language spoken in class, ranging from 10-100%. In their second study, Polio and Duff (1994) examined recordings of the foreign language classes investigated in their first study in order to determine the functions for which English was used in each of the classes. Due to the expense of transcription and translation of the recordings, only six hours of data from the original study were examined in the follow-up study - one each from instructors of six different languages. The researchers identified eight categories of English use in the classroom: administrative vocabulary, grammar instruction, classroom management, indexing solidarity, for English practice by the teacher, providing translations of unknown target language vocabulary, remedying apparent lack of student comprehension, and interaction effect involving students' use

of English (that is, teachers switched to English in response to students' use of English). Through interviews, the instructors provided the reasons for their use of English. The main one cited was learners' lack of requisite vocabulary and the complexity and importance of content. Polio and Duff criticize some reasons for using the L1 in class, suggesting that time would be better spent speaking the target language, and they provide suggestions for avoiding unnecessary use of the students' L1. While they admit that it is difficult to make generalizations about all instructors based on these six hours of data, their results shed some light on teachers' actual use of students' native language in these foreign language classes.

Numerous studies in other academic settings also seek to describe patterns of code switching in foreign and second language classes. In his study of South African high schools, for example, Adendorff (1996) found code switching to be a communicative resource that enabled teachers and students to accomplish both educational and social objectives. In this setting, English was the official language of instruction, but the teacher used the students' and the teachers' native language, Zulu, to fulfil several social functions such as expressing encouragement and marking solidarity with students. Adendorff (1996) suggests that teachers use code switching to express solidarity, power and distance. He suggests the need for teacher training and consciousness-raising in order to encourage teachers to see multilingualism as a communicative resource rather than a curse and to sensitize teachers to the notion that language choice is not neutral but has important symbolic associations.

Many reasons are cited for teachers and students using students' native language in class, but one that is commonly cited seems to be lexical gaps. In his study of German learners of English in a bilingual German school, Butzkamm (1998) found the students'

native language to be what he called a "conversational lubricant." In the class he observed, German was not used for social purposes but for educational ones, as students switched from German to English principally to ask for the vocabulary they needed in order to contribute to a class discussion. The students' L1 was used only as a bilingual dictionary and made teaching more efficient, as students could easily learn the words they needed to express themselves. Butzkamm (1998) suggests that teachers should consider students' native language a natural shortcut to learning that should be utilized where appropriate, instead of avoiding code switching in class entirely. It should be pointed out that the class observed was a history class in a bilingual school, where pupils presumably have other contact with English and many other opportunities to speak and hear English; moreover, the students were in their third year of English and were therefore more advanced in their foreign language than the primary learners in the current study. Thus the "bilingual dictionary" function of students' L1 in this class may not be the most common in the classes considered in the current study.

Antón and DiCamilla (1998) suggest that psychologically, L1 helped learners to communicate with each other and to help provide scaffolding for one another. This is when learners used their shared native language in order to accomplish tasks together, with each learner contributing his or her own grammatical and lexical knowledge to the production of a written text. The native language also helped to organize the accomplishing of the task, with learners using their native language to share strategies, decide how to solve problems, and to retain their focus on the task.

Several studies describe the ways that code switching can serve social functions in the classroom. The terms that the various researchers use vary but they parallel each other, in that they all describe the ways that learners alternate languages in order to negotiate

social identities, tending to use one language for official classroom purposes and another for more personal communication. For example, Canagarajah (1995) described the languages used in classrooms in Jaffna, Sri Lanka, for various micro-functions, such as giving directions, managing discipline, giving commands, reviewing content and requesting help. He determined that English, the L2, was used primarily for interaction strictly related to the textbook and the lesson, but Tamil, the L1, was used for all other interactions, for example, those that were personal or unofficial in nature. He suggests that language switching in the classroom allows students the opportunity to learn the values behind each code and to discover how to negotiate identities through code switching.

Moffatt (1991), in her study of three- and four-year-old Punjabi speakers in England, found that even young speakers varied their language choice according to topic and the interlocutors' native language. This indicates that even young children had learned how to choose among the languages at their disposal, with certain languages being associated with specific topics and people. The teachers of these classes expressed the importance of using students' L1 for cognitive and linguistic reasons, such as the efficiency of learning and the need to extend these young children's L1 ability; they also mentioned emotional and social reasons, such as self-esteem, and the prevention of possible downgrading of the status of the L1. Clearly, the needs of young bilinguals such as those Moffatt studied are significantly different from those of university-level foreign language learners in the U.S. However, the code switching behaviour with both groups is influenced by both cognitive and social factors.

The studies discussed above all make similar distinctions between personal and official language use in foreign and second language classrooms. The terms on and off stage, on

and off record, official and personal, official and peer-to-peer language, cognitive/linguistic vs. emotional/social have clear parallels to one another, and these studies suggest that motivations for code switching are complex and comprise much more than simply occasions when one cannot remember a particular word.

2.3 Approaches in Code Switching

Appel and Muysken (1987) had identified three approaches to code switching: psycholinguistic, linguistic or grammatical and sociolinguistic.

2.3.1 Psycholinguistic Approaches to Code Switching

Psycholinguistic approaches to bilingualism examine those aspects of language capacity that enable speakers to alternate languages. For example, one might study the psycholinguistic mechanisms involved in production and reception of multilingual speech; that is, what kinds of abilities are required in order to use and understand two or more languages in succession or simultaneously, or what role does proficiency play in multilingual language processing and production, or are different categories such as content and function words processed differently. Related to questions of processing are questions of storage and acquisition of multiple languages.

Weinreich (1953) identified three possible types of bilinguals. Coordinate bilinguals may be compared to two monolinguals with two separate, parallel systems which have separate lexicons as well as separate sets of concepts to which lexical items are mapped. For example, coordinate bilinguals might have both the English word "book" mapped to a notion of a book, and the German word "Buch" which maps to a separate notion of a German book. Compound bilinguals, on the other hand, are assumed to have one set of concepts, for example, containing the notion of a book, but with two sets of lexical

items and grammatical rules to express that notion, e.g., "book" and "Buch." For subordinate bilinguals, one language is dominant to the language or languages, and the subordinate languages are processed through and with the help of the dominant language.

Determining the organization and storage of multiple languages in the brain is one goal of psycholinguistics. Grosjean (1985) suggests that a monolingual view of language use has coloured much of the study of bilingualism or multilingualism, which has led to widespread beliefs that "ideal" bilinguals should be the equivalent of two monolinguals. Such a belief in the existence and superiority of ideal bilinguals takes into account neither social factor nor significant psycholinguistic differences in the ways that multi-linguals acquire and use the languages in their repertoires. Grosjean (1985) stresses the need for more study to be conducted from a multilingual perspective. For example, while psycholinguists have looked at how languages are activated one at a time in a multilingual brain, little attention has been paid to the simultaneous activation that is required for code switching. In addition, more work must be done to describe bilinguals' mixed competence as distinct from the competence in two separate languages, and studies should focus on language processing when language input and output are monolingual as well as when in- and output are multilingual.

Finally, Grosjean (1985) suggests that multi-lingual have a continuum of "speech modes" which ranges from completely monolingual to multilingual. It would therefore be necessary to determine what mode speakers are in before making any claims about their language processing or competence. That is, if a speaker is in a fully multilingual mode while speaking, one may draw different conclusions about their language competence rather than if that speaker is in a more monolingual mode. It may be

difficult to determine this mode but it would be useful to know whether speakers are aware of which language or languages they are using rather than assuming that they are in a monolingual mode. To sum up, according to Grosjean, multilingualism and code switching should be approached from a multilingual, not monolingual perspective because an approach that assumes that multilingualism is normal and not deviant from mono-lingualism may yield truer insights into the organization of functioning of the multilingual brain, including the production and processing of code switching.

2.3.2   Linguistic Approaches to Code Switching

Linguistic approaches to code switching seek to identify grammatical rules for language alternation—that is, the morpho-syntactic constraints that limit language choice within sentences. Poplack (1980)'s work proposed the free morpheme constraint and the equivalence constraint. According to the free morpheme constraint, speakers are more likely to switch languages after constituents that are not bound morphemes. The equivalence constraint suggests that code switching may occur at points where the surface structures of the languages correspond to each other; that is, the juxtaposition of the elements from the two languages cannot violate syntactic rules of either language. Although these suggested constraints were supported by studies involving typologically closely related language pairs such as English-Spanish and English-French, research with different language pairs questions the universal applicability of such rules. Although Poplack's (1980) constraints may not be universally applicable across all possible groupings of languages, they represent an important early step in systematically describing the morpho-syntactic workings of code switching.

Among theories that grew from Poplack's work is Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame model (1993 and 1998), which suggests several hypotheses to account for

morpho-syntactic patterns of code switching. She begins by distinguishing two types of languages involved in code switching: the matrix language, also known as host language, and the embedded language, or donor. She further distinguishes content morphemes, which are similar to open-class items, e.g., verbs, prepositions, nouns, and descriptive adjectives; and system morphemes, which are similar to closed-class items and include inflections, articles, quantifiers and possessive adjectives. Her matrix language hypothesis states that the matrix language provides the order of morphemes and that system morphemes must come from the matrix language. The Matrix Language Frame model builds on earlier work by Poplack and others in providing detailed systematic description of possible morpho-syntactic mechanisms of code switching.

Muysken (1997) advocates a different approach to describing code switching structurally. He suggests that apparent exceptions to constraints for code switching may be explained by considering not one but three structurally distinct types of intra-sentential code switching, namely alternation, insertion and congruent lexicalization. Alternation is described as a true switch from one language to another, which means that both grammar and lexicon switch. With alternation, there is no embedding of one language within another, but there is juxtaposition of two or more languages.

Linguists might also approach code switching diachronically in order to determine the role that language alternation might play in language change over time. Code switching by individuals can result in long term language change as foreign words are permanently integrated into a language or as the grammatical systems of separate languages begin to resemble one another over time.

2.3.3   Sociolinguistic Approaches to Code Switching

A third approach to code switching, and the one mainly guiding this study, is sociolinguistic, which seeks to describe not how but why speakers alternate languages. This approach can be further subdivided into what Auer (1984) calls sociolinguistic and interactional approaches. Sociolinguistic approaches take a macro view of language use across entire speech communities to determine which communities engage in code switching and to study the role of each language in the community.

 For example, this approach seeks to identify and describe speech communities in which almost everyone speaks both or all languages as well as those in which not everyone speaks all languages or not to the same degree. One might also describe communities in which languages have very different prestige and functions; for instance, one language might be the typical language of the home and family while another is used mainly in official contexts such as school and government. Some official languages may have overt prestige while at the same time being resented because of their historic or social status, as may be the case in some former colonies.

Sociolinguistic approaches to code switching look at large overarching issues of language use in speech communities. In contrast, interactional approaches take a more micro view of language use, trying to identify the social meaning carried by specific switches in discourse. Such an approach closely examines conversations in order to interpret speakers' intent and the effect on the hearer. Interactional approaches to analyze the local functions of specific examples of language alternation by studying individual switches in their conversational contexts.

One linguist who took such an interactional approach is John Gumperz. His 1982 work, Discourse Strategies, laid the groundwork for later studies and helped define some of the key concepts in the field of code switching. One distinction that Gumperz (1982) makes is between situational and conversational code switching. In situational code switching, language varieties are used in distinct settings and with distinct categories of speakers, and language switches coincide with changes in the setting, topic, or participants. In contrast, conversational code switching is characterized as the alternating use of multiple languages within a single conversation, not necessarily with a change in setting or participant constellation.

A subset of conversational code switching is what Gumperz (1982) calls metaphorical code switching, in which speakers alternate languages in order to evoke a certain mood or to change their footing, or relative status, with respect to the other speakers. Code choice may or may not be salient to speakers in such settings; speakers and listeners themselves must establish local norms for the interpretation of code switching. That is, each speech community develops its own standards and patterns for language alternation which are part of the communicative competence for that community. Among other things, Gumperz (1982-143) says that speakers must learn to distinguish "meaningful and non meaningful contrasts". This means that some code switches bear meaning while others do not, and it is up to speakers to decipher the difference. Such knowledge can only be acquired through experience in specific speech communities.

Based on research in three different multilingual speech communities, Gumperz (1982) developed a typology that describes some common functions of metaphorical code switching, a type of conversational code switching. Metaphorical switches involve shifts in the relative status of speakers or of the aspects of their identity which they

prefer to emphasize but are not accompanied by changes in topic or other extra linguistic situation such as setting. Gumperz (1982) points out that there is no one-to-one correspondence between linguistic choice and extra-linguistic situation; that is, a code switch does not always coincide with a change in communicative intent.

 The following functions of code switching occurred in all three data sets that Gumperz examined:

1) Language alternation can be used to indicate that the speaker is quoting another person. The language of the original statement need not match the language of the later citation; the contrast in language variety serves to distance the speaker from the content of the quotation, not necessarily to render it in the exact words of the original.

2) Speakers may switch in order to specify their addressees; switching languages allows speakers to address specific interlocutors in a group and to exclude others, perhaps by choosing the dominant language of the person being addressed; speakers may also change languages in order to attract a listener's attention.

3) Code switching is used in interjections; speakers may switch because of personal emotional associations with different languages, or because certain filler expressions come to mind more readily in language than in another.

4) Speakers use code switching to reiterate their message; that is, they may repeat the same content in each of their languages in order to clarify or emphasize certain information.

5) Code switching serves to express qualifications to messages; the main content is expressed in one language, while additional explanation or detail is given in another in order to provide emphasis or clarity through linguistic contrast.

6) Code switching can be used to personalize a message; certain languages in speakers' repertoires may be used to express objective facts, while others are associated with subjective opinion.

Speakers using codes associated with facts may wish to distance themselves from the content of the message or to attach a certain authority to it, while speakers using codes associated with emotion may want to emphasize their feelings rather than facts. Related to the notion of emotional distance are Gumperz (1982)'s concepts of 'we' code vs. 'they' code. In some speech communities, codes are strongly associated with political and cultural identity. In multilingual communities that include social minorities, the language of the minority is often considered the we-code, or the code that indexes in-group membership. The language of the dominant group is the they-code and indexes power and formality, often because of its association with official political authority. We- and they-codes are often found in former colonial settings, where the language of the colonized indexes in-group membership and contrasts with they-code of the colonizers. The notion of we and they-codes has detractors.

Appel and Muysken (1987) describe a functional model of code switching to explain why speakers alternate languages. They identify six functions of code switching: referential, directive, expressive, phatic, metalinguistic and poetic.

Gumperz (1982) has described 12 conversational code switching that are used to analyze data in this study. They are 'representation of speech' where code switching is employed to represent a talk, 'quotation' when code switching involves imitation and change in tone of voice to play a particular character and 'turn accommodation' where code switching occurs between speakers' turns. Other than that there are also 'topic shift' in which the code switching occurs due to a change of topic in conversation, 'situation switch' (on/off topic in academic work) when code switching is marking a switch between formal and non-formal talk, 'insistence' (non-command) in which the code switching indicating a child's persistence in a specific idea. The child usually repeats the same utterance in both languages. Beside these, there is also 'emphasis' (command) where code switching used to put emphasis on a specific command, 'clarification' or 'persuasion' to give more information or clarify an idea or message, 'person specification' in situation where children referred to another person during their conversation and also 'question shift' in which the code switching indicating a switch in language when children had questions. Gumperz (1982) also outlined 'discourse marker' which is a linguistic element that does not necessarily add to the content of the utterance but act as marker of the context in which the utterance is taking place. There is also a category of others which is used to code instances in which the function of the code switching could not be identified.

The functions that Appel and Muysken (1987) described to some extent overlapped with Gumperz's (1982) proposed typology but the two sets are distinct from one another. Although, the list of functions produced by these different researchers underscore, Appel and Muysken's (1987) points that the functions of code switching vary widely from one speech community to the next.

Gumperz's (1982) and Appel and Muysken's (1987) theories about the functions of code switching have certain parallels with Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model (1988 and 1993). Myers-Scotton proposes four types of code switching: sequential unmarked code switching, code switching as an unmarked choice, code switching as a marked choice, and exploratory code switching. In sequential unmarked code switching, the unmarked code changes when the situation or topic or constellation of participants changes. Such code switching can be used either to increase or decrease social distance to other speakers and is comparable to Gumperz (1982) metaphorical switching. Finally, exploratory code switching occurs when speakers are uncertain which code is the unmarked one in a given situation, possibly because the setting is novel or because speakers are unfamiliar with their interlocutors' language skills and preferences.

Early research in this area has identified the types of code switching and the factors affecting it (e.g., Ervin-Tripp (1964), Fishman (1965), Gumperz, (1964, 1967), Gumperz & Hernández-Chavez (1975). Code switching varies according to the situation (situational code switching), within a conversation (metaphorical code switching) and according to discourse function (e.g., to convey intimacy, or to emphasize a message). Research on children's code switching has shown that simultaneous bilinguals develop knowledge on how and when to use their two languages depending on the addressee, the topic of the conversation, and the situation by Fantini (1985).

More recently, Genesee and his colleagues (Genesee, 2002; Genesee, Boivin, & Nicoladis, 1996) have found that French–English bilinguals as young as 2 years of age develop the ability to use and adjust each of their languages differentially and appropriately with parents and an unfamiliar interlocutor as part of their communicative competence. Genesee (2002-190) goes further to state that "true bilingual

communicative competence entails the ability to adapt one's language use on-line in accordance with relevant characteristics of the situation, including the preferred or more proficient language of one's interlocutor".

In the early 1980s there was increased interest in studying children's code switching (Álvarez, 1979; Genishi, 1976; Zentella, 1982, 1997).These studies have shed some light on how bilingual children use different languages according to addressee and context.

In the classic code switching study by Poplack (1980), the findings pointed out that code switching was used by those individuals whose language skills in both languages were balanced and this might indicate development of bilingual communicative competence in children who are still learning second language (Reyes, 2001). However, we do not know well how "developing bilingual children" develop the ability to code switch over the years and how they make use of this strategy during peer interaction.

A number of researchers have suggested that code switching in language classroom is not always a blockage or deficiency in learning a language, but may be considered as a useful strategy in classroom interaction, if the aim is to make meaning clear and to transfer the knowledge to students in an efficient way (Sert, 2005). Sometimes, according to Sert (2005), the use of code switching might have a long term negative effect to the biliguals in learning the target language. This may lead to loss in fluency of the target language. The more frequent the pupils use code switching, the bigger the chance for them to face fluency loss in mastering target language. Other than that, students might face de-motivation in learning English as they use code switching in most of their study years. This might lead to some of the undesired behaviours among

the students. The students might lose their interest in learning English in the future as they sometimes use their mother tongue to communicate in most of their daily lives either during class or outside the class. As mentioned by Sert (2005), a learner might lose his or her interest in learning the target language as he or she knows that he or she will always get the chance to code switch and this might result in negative academic consequences as the learner does not learn the target language appropriately.

Using the scientific evidence from studies with young Spanish–English bilinguals, Mc Clure (1981) and Zentella (1997) reports that younger children show more lexical item code switching than adults. A common assumption to explain this finding is that children code switch when they do not know the word in one language. Hence, they draw on the other language. It is incorrect, however, to assume that all cases of this type of code switch are the result of incomplete knowledge of one of the languages. In some cases, children might be momentarily unable to access a word for a concept in the language in use, but can access one more readily in the other language. On the other hand, older children seem to manipulate their linguistic codes for a wider variety of stylistic purposes and situational demands than younger children do as said by Zentella (1997).

 In a study with peer Turkish–Danish bilinguals, Jorgensen (1998) found that 7- to 10-year-olds could manipulate their two languages for power-wielding purposes. The children in his study especially the boys strove to gain control of the conversation when involved in problem-solving tasks. Research findings also indicate that male children code switch when they learn that elements of the other language convey the meaning of the intended idea more accurately (Halmari & Smith, 1994; Zentella, 1997). However, we do not know well how "developing bilingual children" develop the ability to code

switch over the years and how they make use of this strategy during peer interaction in mixed gender communication or single gender interaction.

Early researchers in the field of bilingualism posited that children were born monolingual (Volterra & Taescher, 1978) and that bilingualism, if it developed, developed from a monolingual brain. They posited three stages of bilingual development. This included that the child has two languages and 1 lexicon and that the child has two languages and one syntactical system; and finally a different linguistic systems develop. These researchers reported that code-switching happens at all of these stages of bilingual development because the brain was wired for monolingualism and because children were randomly using two lexical and syntactical systems in acts of communication.

Genesee (2002) challenged the work of Volterra & Taescher and carried out a series of studies with emerging bilinguals in Canada. These studies examined code-switching and other behaviors in early simultaneous bilinguals who were learning French/English. Genesse's studies concluded that children even at the 1-2 word stage of language acquisition are functionally bilingual, and that code-switching among emerging bilinguals is neither random nor done because children are confusing two language systems. He established that children's use of two languages simultaneously is generally done strategically. Genesse posits that human brains are hard wired not just for one language, but for two or more.

As a result of the early and pervasive view point that babies were hard wired to be monolingual, early researchers on bilingualism looked for evidence that children were able to separate out the languages that they were learning to link each of theses

experiences to a social world as found by Kenner (2004). Ability to strictly separate two languages in oral and written language was and is considered a sign of linguistic competence and language mixing or code-switching was and is considered to be a sign of deficiencies in one or both languages or cross-language confusion. Bilingual competency is linked to language separation by Fantini (1985). Other researchers have begun to argue that simultaneous bilinguals which defined as children who acquire and/or are exposed to two languages from the time they are born, do not strictly separate two languages, rather they use two languages strategically in oral and written communication, and that code-switching is an important aspect of this bilingual development as said by Baker (2001) and Zentella (1997).

Meisel (1994) quoted, 'the ability to select the language according to the interlocutor, the situational context, the topic of conversation, and so forth, and to change languages within an interactional sequence in accordance with sociolinguistic rules and without violating specific grammatical constraints'. This also implies the capacity of language differentiation, language choice, and the mastery of the two grammatical systems of the languages involved. In order to establish the language context in which the code-switching occurs, it is defined that the base language is as the one established by the interlocutor in the recording situation (Meisel 1994 and Muysken 1995)

In several studies on bilingual first language acquisition it has been observed that almost all children pass through a stage in which they mix to a very large extent both of their languages (Lanza 1992 and Deuchar & Quay 2000), but there is no consensus how to analyze these mixes, namely as instances of a lack of language separation, as a result of missing equivalent words or as code-switching.

The hypothesis that children do not differentiate their two language systems, that has been brought up by some studies (Taeschner 1983, Deuchar and Quay 2000), has largely been disconfirmed by several studies (among others Genesee 1989 and Meisel 1989). It seems a clear fact that children do separate their two languages from the very early age onwards. Lexical need as the trigger for mixing an element into the other language could be an explanation for some mixes, but is definitely not the only reason as found by Cantone & Müller (2003). Therefore it remains an open question why there is this stage of high mixing at the beginning of language acquisition, that is in the one-word stage and at the beginning of the two-words stage.

What can be said is that the children give evidence of being capable of using their language in a proper context. Nevertheless, we won't take the earliest mixes into account for our analysis, for the simple reason that, as mentioned above, in this stage children's utterances are rarely longer than one or two words, so that it is very difficult to analyze them from a syntactic point of view.

2.4   Gender and Language Learning

Based on these previous findings by Dubois and Crouch (1975), there are few common characteristics to distinguish communication in mixed talk conversation. Most common characteristics are men interrupt both men and women more while women and girls interrupt less, men and boys talk more, talk longer and code switch more than women. Finally men is said to have more turns than women. Findings from the present study will support or reject these findings.

Other than that, Jariah Mohd Jan (2003) studied talk exchanges among working adults involving both genders in office meetings. Participants develop a strategy of code-

switching to exert power in a particular context and to negotiate language choice. Here, language choice is a tool for wielding power because it borrows its status from 'societal inequality' and it symbolically expresses convergence with and divergence from the other's code. Current study will agree or disagree with language choice being a tool for wielding power by both gender.

Besides that, Lakoff (1980) has indicated that men and women communicate in different styles. Differences occur between two genders in various kinds of conversation and context. We can no longer verify Lakoff's claims in relation to men and women in the USA in 1975, but we can see if they are true now of men and women in our own country or locality.

Griggs and Dunn (2003) had examined gender differences and the effect on second-language learning and teaching. The study sets forth the context in which gender, second-language acquisition, and instructional dynamics have gained currency in recent years and then discusses ways in which the interplay of these three elements are operationalized in the classroom, the principal focus of discourse being on the Mexican-American community. A significant attribute of Mexican-American society across social classes is the multigenerational cohesiveness of family life, shaped by hierarchically determined values and priorities as said by Griggs and Dunn(2003). The binding of parents and children extends not just between the generations but across three generations. This is a hierarchical generational relationship, with children at the bottom; they are expected to show respect and unquestioning obedience to both parents and grandparents in general and to their father in particular, as well as to those included in the extended family such as baptismal Compadres (coparents) who are sponsors who assume carefully defined roles linked by tradition through interlocking obligations of mutual aid and respect. To a significant degree, roles of are engendered. Finding of the

study showed that bilingual and English-as-a-Second-Language education methods are somehow a threat to American culture and values in which the writer says that 80% of Hispanics (minimum age 5) speak Spanish at home, and 40% either speak Spanish only or do not speak English well. The practical effect of these demographics is that elementary-school teachers--particularly though not exclusively in California, Texas, Florida, New York, and Illinois--have become de facto ESL teachers, being obliged to convey both curriculum content and language-acquisition skills to a significant student population. Reading instruction is especially challenging. Methods of engaging the ESL student in comprehension exercises have evolved, such as pairing ESL students with native English speakers and inviting each in turn to "say something," or react orally to a given text, or initiating classroom discussions from which ESL students can benefit because of what other students say. How gender figures into classroom dynamics like these has to be connected to observations that, in general, teachers tend to prefer male to female students, i.e., inviting male participation much more than female participation in class in a way which effects the female participant's confidence in speaking a particular language.

In studying language, linguistic features such as speech is important - but in studying language and gender we must be able to apply the speech such as speech acts, cooperative principle or politeness strategies. With gender as a variable, we need to study whether men and women show any broad differences in the way they do things. Gender does make a difference. As said by Tannen (1993), that this difference is not universal - so there will be men who exhibit "feminine" conversational qualities - or women who follow the conversational styles associated with men. Computer-mediated conversation (Internet relay chat, for example) is interesting because here people choose or assume their gender - and this may not be the same as their biological sex.

In Living Language book, the authors Keith and Shuttleworth (2008) suggest that women talk more than men, talk too much, are more polite, are indecisive/hesitant, complain and nag, ask more questions, support each other, are more co-operative, whereas men - swear more, don't talk about emotions, talk about sport more, talk about women and machines in the same way, insult each other frequently, are competitive in conversation, dominate conversation, speak with more authority, give more commands and interrupt more.

A 1980 study by O'Barr and Atkins, looked at courtroom cases and witnesses' speech. Their findings challenge Lakoff's (1980) view of women's language. In researching what they describe as "powerless language", they show that language differences are based on situation-specific authority or power and not gender. Of course, there may be social contexts where women are (for other reasons) more or less the same as those who lack power. But this is a far more limited claim than that made by Dale Spender (2005), who identifies power with a male patriarchal order - the theory of dominance. O'Barr and Atkins (1980) studied courtroom cases for 30 months, observing a broad spectrum of witnesses. They examined the witnesses for the ten basic speech differences between men and women that Lakoff (1980) proposed. O'Barr and Atkins (1980) discovered that the differences that Lakoff (1980) and others supported are not necessarily the result of being a women but being powerless. O'Barr and Atkins (1980-148) concluded from their study that the quoted speech patterns were "neither characteristic of all women nor limited only to women". The women who used the lowest frequency of women's language traits had an unusually high status (according to the researchers). They were well-educated professionals with middle class backgrounds. A corresponding pattern was noted among the men who spoke with a low frequency of women's language traits.

O'Barr and Atkins (1980) tried to emphasize that a powerful position "may derive from either social standing in the larger society and/or status accorded by the court".

Dominance theory is the theory that in mixed-sex conversations men are more likely to interrupt than women. It uses a fairly old study of a small sample of conversations, recorded by Don Zimmerman and Candace West at the Santa Barbara campus of the University of California in 1975. The subjects of the recording were white, middle class and under 35. Zimmerman and West (1975) produce in evidence 31 segments of conversation. They report that in 11 conversations between men and women, men used 46 interruptions, but women only two. As Geoffrey Beattie (1982), of Sheffield University, points out: "The problem with this is that you might simply have one very voluble man in the study which has a disproportionate effect on the total." From their small sample Zimmerman and West conclude that, since men interrupt more often, then they are dominating or attempting to do so (25-28).

In a study named Conversational Insecurity (1990), Fishman questions Lakoff's (1980) theories. Lakoff (1980) suggests that asking questions shows women's insecurity and hesitancy in communication, whereas Fishman (1990) looks at questions as an attribute of interactions. Women ask questions because of the power of how men respond or don't respond, not because of their personality weaknesses. Fishman (1990) also claims that in mixed-sex language interactions, men speak on average for twice as long as women.

2.5   Speech Act Theory

Speech act is a technical term in linguistics and the philosophy of language. The contemporary use of the term goes back to John L. Austin's (1950) doctrine of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary act is a performance of an utterance and hence of a speech act. The term equally refers to the surface meaning of an utterance. Perlocutionary is a speech act viewed at the level of its psychological consequence such as persuading, convincing or making someone to realize. Meanwhile, illocutionary act is a term in linguistics introduced by John L. Austin. It is a performative and constative utterances which investigate multiple meaning in a speech acts. Many scholars identify 'speech acts' with illocutionary acts, rather than locutionary or perlocutionary acts. As with the notion of illocutionary acts, there are different opinions on the nature of speech acts. The extension of speech acts is commonly taken to include such acts as promising, ordering, greeting, warning, inviting someone and congratulating. The concept of an illocutionary act is central to the concept of a speech act. John R. Searle, "speech act" is often meant to refer just to the same thing as the term illocutionary act. Searle (1975) has set up the following classification of illocutionary speech acts:

- Representative = speech acts that commit a speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, e.g. reciting a creed

- directives = speech acts that are to cause the hearer to take a particular action, e.g. requests, commands and advice

- commissives = speech acts that commit a speaker to some future action, e.g. promises and oaths

- expressives = speech acts that express the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards the proposition, e.g. congratulations, excuses and thanks

- declarations = speech acts that change the reality in accord with the proposition of the declaration, e.g. baptisms, pronouncing someone guilty or pronouncing someone husband and wife

Searle's early work, which did a great deal to establish his reputation, was on speech acts. He attempted to synthesize ideas from many colleagues including J.L. Austin (the term "illocutionary act"), Ludwig Wittgenstein (the observation that linguistic meaning is "rule-governed"), G.C.J. Midgley (the distinction between regulative and constitutive rules), and his own thesis, in 'Speech Acts,' that such acts are constituted by the rules of language. In his 1969 book Speech Acts, Searle sets out to combine all of these elements to give an account of so-called 'illocutionary acts', which Austin had introduced in 'How To Do Things with Words'.

Searle (1975) provides an analysis of the allegedly prototypical illocutionary act of promising, and offers sets of semantical rules intended to represent the linguistic meaning of devices indicating further (supposed) illocutionary act types.

Among the concepts presented in the book is the distinction between the 'illocutionary force' and the 'propositional content' of an utterance. Searle does not precisely define the former as such, but rather introduces several possible illocutionary forces by example. According to Searle, the sentences

1. Sam smokes habitually.

2. Does Sam smoke habitually?

3. Sam, smoke habitually!

4. Would that Sam smoked habitually!

each indicate the same propositional content (Sam smoking habitually) but differ in the illocutionary force indicated (a statement, a question, a command, and an expression of)

Searle's speech-act theory has been challenged by F.C. Doerge, Burkhardt (1990) and Lepore and van Gulick (1991) because what Searle presents is in fact extremely sketchy, and can certainly not be viewed, as it often is, as an elaborated theory. It is further argued that the fundamental assumptions about language which Searle intends to illustrate with his account of "illocutionary acts" are mistaken, so that in general a theory following the lines Searle suggests is doomed to failure. Finally it is shown that Searle's account of "illocutionary acts", as far as it goes, is not an adequate adoption of the conception Austin introduced. Hence Searle's account is no reasonable alternative to Austin's account.

Speech act studies by Searle (1975), have attracted a number of linguists working on gender and politeness (Holmes 1995; Mills 2003). For instance, the speech act of complimenting has been regarded as highly gendered and one of positive politeness strategies. Taking the culture-specific notion of power Chie Adachi (2009) investigates how gender and power relation play a key role in understanding the production of Japanese speech acts between different gender. Having conducted semi-structured sociolinguistic interviews and informal lunchtime recordings, her analysis is based on 369 speech acts extracted from a corpus. The results show stylistic differences (casual vs. careful speech) in the production of compliments across gender and it is more likely to exchange speech acts from the social status of low to high than vice versa. These results contradict previous research (Knapp et al 1984; Wolfson 1983). The paper argues that not solely gender or power relations determine the patterning of speech act production, but also the contextual and cultural considerations allow for better understanding behaviour.

Several studies suggest that females are more prone to produce directives whilst males prone for other speech acts (Mulac, Bradac and Gibbons, 2001) but McCaulay, 2001 examined how different genders comprehend various speech acts. Gender and speech behaviour are also seen as two interwoven, interrelated variables (Lakoff 1975; Tannen 1990; Boxer 1993; Holmes 1995). In other words, speech behaviours depend on the gender relationship between interlocutors. Thus refusing people of either the same or the opposite gender requires different linguistic patterns.

In this study, the researcher confined herself to study the transcription for linguistic feature of speech act based on Searle's theory (1975) alone. This is due to time constraint and also limited results it can produce to this small subject orientated study.

2.6   Summary

These are the main elements that mould the current study of code switching. The approaches that the researcher reviewed here have given better understanding and knowledge in preparing this study. The knowledge from previous research has helped in setting up the framework in Chapter Three and analyzing the data in the Chapter Four.