Tagalog-English Code-Switching in English Language Classes: Frequency and Forms

TESOL Journal
Vol. 1, pp. 28-42
©2009
http://www.tesol-journal.com

Ariane Macalinga Borlongan
Department of English and Applied Linguistics
De La Salle University

Abstract

This study looks at Tagalog-English code-switching practices of teachers and students in English language classes in Metro Manila schools in the Philippines. A total of 14 English language classes whose discourses have been transcribed were analyzed to determine how frequent teachers and students code-switch in those classes and bring to light the forms and functions of the code-switches of both the teachers and students. The analysis of the data reveals that most English language teachers in the sample (11 out of 14 or 78.57%) code-switch – and therefore "violate" the implementing policy – and they code-switch in around less than 5 to almost fifty utterances or a little less than fifteen, at the average, in the entire class session. students also have their share of code-switching in class sessions. All classes recorded at least more than one instance of code-switched utterances. However, though the instances of code-switching could be claimed to be significant, one's tendency to code-switch is more of an individual-specific trait. Tagalog-English code-switching in the data are most in the form of – or strategy – smooth-code-switching, at almost four-fifth of the total number of code-switches in the data. Constituent insertion follows but very, very from smooth switching. Nonce borrowings and non-smooth switches are relatively few.

Today, the implementing 1987 Constitution, Article IV, Sections 6-9, has this to say:

Section 6. The national language of the Philippines is Filipino. As it evolves, it shall be further developed and enriched on the basis of existing Philippine and other languages. Subject to the provisions of law and as the Congress may deem appropriate, the Government shall take steps to initiate and sustain the use of Filipino as a medium of official communication and as language of instruction in the educational system.

Section 7. For purposes of communication and instruction, the official languages of the Philippines are Filipino and, unless otherwise provided by law, English. The regional languages are the auxiliary official languages and shall serve as auxiliary

media of instruction therein. Spanish and Arabic shall be promoted on a voluntary and optional basis.

Section 8. This constitution shall be promulgated in Filipino and English and shall be translated into major regional languages, Arabic, and Spanish.

Section 9. The Congress shall establish a national language commission composed of representatives of various regions and disciplines which shall undertake the, coordinate, and promote researches for the development, propagation, and preservation of Filipino and other languages.

And the Bilingual Education Policy of 1987 – originally promulgated in 1974 – in particular aims for an enhanced learning through English and Filipino and the development a bilingual nation competent in the use of both English and Filipino. A clear separation of the use of English and Filipino in schools was made: English is to be used as the language in teaching English, mathematics, and science while Filipino is for other subjects. The only difference of the 1987 promulgation from that of 1974 is that the latter allows for the use of major vernaculars in Grades I and II.

Current president Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo has once again highlighted (the importance of) English by issuing Executive Order 210, an order establishing the policy to strengthen the use of English as the language of instruction as she deemed it necessary "to develop the aptitude, competence and proficiency of our students in the English language to maintain and improve their competitive edge in emerging and fast-growing local and international industries, particularly in the area of Information and Communications Technology [ICT]".

Alternative Views on Code-Switching in Philippine Education

Though the current policies – both the 1987 Bilingual Education Policy and the recent order from President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo – do not, in any way, argue against code-switching in teaching and learning, the classic interpretation and usual implementation of these policies have always precluded code-switching as a language mode in Philippine classrooms. The understanding is that both teachers and students would use *solely* English in English language, mathematics, and science classes and *solely* Filipino in all the others. Teachers are reprimanded by their supervisors and other superiors when observed to be code-switching during teaching while students are penalized for speaking the unwanted language in class. And while the policies have only indicated English language, mathematics, and science classes as English-using classes, the want to be more proficient in English has prompted quite numerous schools to adopt the very popular English-only

policies throughout everyone's stay inside the school, except in the designated Filipino-using classes.[1]

While this has mostly been the situation, more progressive ideas as regards the use of code-switching in Philippine education have recently been espoused by some scholars and educators, more prominently by Professor Allan B. I. Bernardo of De La Salle University and Dr. Isabel Pefianco Martin of the Ateneo de Manila University. In a paper dated 2005, Bernardo proposed:

> code-switching can be a legitimate and potent resource for learning and teaching for bilingual students and teachers, and that we [Filipinos in general and stakeholders in Philippine education in particular] should relax our language prescription in formal school environments to allow students and teachers to benefit from the use of this *efficacious* resource of developing knowledge and understanding. [emphasis added] (p. 163)

Martin (2006a, 2006b) provides empirical support for Bernardo's (2005) proposal through an examination of tertiary-level classroom discourse. She audio- and video-taped two cases where general education science is taught to freshmen students in two private, non-sectarian universities in Manila, the Philippines. The analysis of the transcriptions of the classroom discourses revealed that code-switching does not prohibit facilitating learning in Science nor achieving proficiency in English. In fact, her data suggested code-switching to be useful in teaching and learning, as it motivates student response and action, ensures rapport and solidarity, promotes shared meaning, checks student understanding, and maintains teacher narrative.

In making policies on language in education therefore, Bernardo (in press) suggests:

> what is needed in multilingual educational communities is a *creative and pragmatic* approach to defining how language could be used in facilitating student learning and achievement. The approach may need to allow the various agents in the learning process to *flexibly* negotiate how the various proficiencies could be best appropriated in specific learning episodes and contexts. [emphases added] (p. 8-9)

He furthers that multilingualism should not be seen as a problem therefore; but rather, it should be regarded as a rich resource in education and teaching and learning that could promote student achievement. Taking it from the paradigm of pedagogy of multiliteracies (The New London Group, 2000), Bernardo (2007) predicts that a holistic understanding of the socio-psycholinguistic reality of multilingualism in the Philippines should make teaching and learning in Philippine schools, colleges, and universities empowering in terms of efficient use of language in communication on the part of the students.

The Present Study

Proposals to consider code-switching as a resource in teaching and learning – such as those of Bernardo (2005, 2007, in press) and Martin (2006a, 2006b) in Philippine

[1] Bernardo's (2007) paper entitled *Language in Philippine Education: Rethinking Old Fallacies, Exploring New Alternatives amidst Globalization* provides a more generic discussion of the issues on language(s) and language policies in Philippine education.

education – is understandable in content subjects; however, the question on whether or not code-switching should be allowed in teaching and learning is a question more difficult in the context of the teaching of languages. Definitely, teachers of science and mathematics, for example, have significantly different teaching and learning objectives from language teachers. They are not concerned with their students' (acquisition and) learning of languages. On the contrary, teachers of languages are. The traditional assumption is that language teachers should – as much as possible and as far as practicable – provide more opportunities for the use of the target language.

The discussion above makes obvious a clear gap in what is to be done with code-switching in English language teaching – at least in Philippine education. There seems to be little that has been done in research on Tagalog-English code-switching in English language teaching, much less on theorizing and – maybe as a result of these circumstances – policy-making on code-switching in this context.

Objectives

This study hopes to fill this gap by looking at Tagalog-English code-switching practices of teachers and students in English language classrooms in Metro Manila, the Philippines. A total of 14 English language classes whose discourses have been transcribed were analyzed to answer the following questions that have often been asked as regards code-switching in the Philippines:

1. How frequent do teachers and students in English language classes code-switch?
2. How do teachers and students in English language classes code-switch?

Data

This study analyzed the texts containing the speech of Filipino teachers of English (and their students in several class sessions) contained in the corpus of Filipino teacher language[2] compiled at De La Salle University, Manila, the Philippines in an attempt to answer the questions posed earlier. The use of a corpus – "a finite-sized body of machine-readable texts, sampled in order to be maximally representative of the language variety under consideration" (McEnery & Wilson, 2001, p. 32) – allows for an analysis of what is actually happening inside Philippine classrooms, most especially in terms of language. Therefore, the compilation of one containing the spoken language of Filipino teachers should provide data readily available for analysis from various linguistic (descriptive linguistics, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, and educational linguistics) and non-linguistic perspectives (educational management, curriculum theory, instructional theory, educational

[2] Marking, annotating, and parsing should constitute the next phase in the development of this corpus. However, it is readily available, including the recordings, to anyone for use in any scholarly endeavor and can be acquired from any of the compilers. At present, the corpus and its texts are simply stored as Microsoft Word file. In all, there are 38 texts of approximately 12 pages each (in font Times New Roman, size 12). It has undergone no marking, annotating, tagging, nor parsing. Since the present study is more interested in language codes (languages that are actually used in the classroom) rather than in the semantic and pragmatic meanings derived from classroom interactions, the corpus does not follow any transcription convention.

psychology, and cognitive psychology). It was toward this end that the British Council in Manila sponsored the compilation of a speech corpus of Filipino teachers.

The corpus was compiled concurrently with the project that had the objective of evaluating the provisions for a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) classroom in (some) primary schools in the Philippines. Hence, the primary schools observed for the evaluative study were the same schools from which the spoken language contained in the corpus was taken. The evaluation of the provision for a CLIL classroom in the Philippines was funded by the British Council Manila, which had selected the schools included in the study. Obviously, this part of the compilation of the corpus affected its representativeness. There were only a total of six government-run schools in Quezon City, National Capital Region that volunteered and were later on provided by the British Council Manila for classroom observation for the CLIL classroom evaluation. Thus, there were only six schools from which the classes for the corpus were sampled. Some classroom observations did not have clear recording, and one was not recorded at all.

As for the recording, in most cases, an MP3 recorder was attached to the teacher's upper garment, with the microphone pinned as close as possible to his/her mouth. A audiotape recorder, on the other hand, was placed either on the teacher's table located in front of the classroom or on the observer's table at the back of the classroom. There were instances when only one of the recorders was used to record the classroom observation. Of course, much of the quality of the recording was affected by how far the microphone attached to the recorders was strategically located to capture the teacher's voice, as well as the students'.

During the recording, an observer was seated at the back of the classroom to find out if the class being observed had provision for CLIL. As expected, the presence of the observer contributed to the naturalness of the classroom (and to the language of the classroom, for that matter). There is a belief among the observers that many of the classes observed were, to some extent, rehearsed prior to the observation – a usual practice in Philippine schools when there are classroom observations, most especially in those which are run by the government.

It is unfortunate that, during the collection of the speech samples, no relevant information on the teachers such as their age, sex, educational attainment, years of teaching experience, and the like as well as the demography of the students were collected. The only known information about the informants of the corpus is that they all belong to primary schools in one of the cities of Metro Manila, both the teachers and the students.

Since it is only concerned with Tagalog-English code-switching in English language teaching, this study only used 14 transcriptions from the said corpus – those of English language classes.

Frequency of Tagalog-English Code-Switching in English Language Teaching

It was posed earlier: How frequent do teachers and students in English language classes code-switch? But the more basic question is: Does code-switching happen in English language teaching? In the case of the classes subjected to analysis in this study, the answer is yes; code-switching does happen in English language teaching. Table 1 answers in those questions in detail:

Table 1
Frequency of Tagalog-English Code-Switched Utterances in the Data

Class	Teacher					Students				
	Tagalog-English Code-Switching		English		Total	Tagalog-English Code-Switching		English		Total
	f	%	*f*	%		*f*	%	*f*	%	
1	3	1.42	208	98.58	211	2	2.30	85	97.70	87
2	4	3.23	120	96.77	124	1	0.94	105	99.06	106
3	13	5.39	228	94.61	241	10	4.57	209	95.43	219
4	17	7.23	218	92.77	235	3	0.99	300	99.01	303
5	20	7.30	254	92.70	274	16	7.34	202	92.66	218
6	6	2.94	198	97.06	204	2	1.31	151	98.69	153
7	0	0.00	130	100.00	130	8	5.71	132	94.29	140
8	7	4.67	143	95.33	150	11	19.64	45	80.36	56
9	0	0.00	93	100.00	93	12	12.90	81	87.10	93
10	46	15.97	242	84.03	288	19	7.09	249	92.91	268
11	46	27.06	124	72.94	170	40	22.47	138	77.53	178
12	4	2.74	142	97.26	146	3	2.05	143	97.95	146
13	0	0.00	111	100.00	111	6	5.36	106	94.64	112
14	12	21.43	44	78.57	56	16	25.00	48	75.00	64
Total	178	7.32	2,255	92.68	2,433	149	6.95	1 994	93.05	2,143
Average	13	7.10	161	92.90	174	11	8.41	142	91.59	153

Looking at Table 1, it could be inferred that most English language teachers in the sample (11 out of 14 or 78.57%) code-switch – and therefore "violate" the implementing policy – and they code-switch in around less than 5 to almost fifty utterances or a little less than fifteen, at the average, in the entire class session. And in almost 2,500 utterances of all the English language teachers in the sample, almost 180 utterances contained at least one instance of code-switching. In terms of percentage, almost 7.5% of all the English language teacher speech contained at least one instance of code-switching.

Meanwhile, students also have their share of code-switching in class sessions. All classes recorded at least more than one instance of code-switched utterances. With all their utterances considered as one per class, they code-switch around more than one to less than fifty times or a little more than ten, at the average, per class session. Almost 150 utterances of the contained at least one instance of code-switching out of almost 2,000 utterances of all the students in the sample. Therefore, almost seven percent of all the student utterances contain at least one instance of code-switching.

Literature on code-switching in teaching and learning has not defined a way to quantify the significance of these frequencies and – therefore – to tell if the number of instances of code-switching in the data is indeed significant; however, if in policy, the understanding is that teachers of the English language should deliver instruction only in English, that students in English language classes should use only English in their classes, and, implicitly, that English language teachers and students of these teachers should never code-switch, then a percentage of around seven percent as the percentage of instance could already be considered a significant percentage.

However, though the instances of code-switching could be claimed to be significant, one's tendency to code-switch is more of an individual-specific trait. This is evidenced by

the three English language teachers who did not code-switch at all. It could be hypothesized that some English language teachers are pre-disposed to code-switch while others are not. Though aware of the policy that they should deliver their English language instruction in the target language, there were instances in the English language teachers' delivery of instruction that they code-switched. And, as was claimed earlier, taken together as a whole, the number of utterances with code-switches is significant.

Forms of Tagalog-English Code-Switching in English Language Teaching

Earlier, Bautista (1998a) identified the forms of Tagalog-English code-switching, thereby answering the question *How do Filipinos code-switch?* Using Poplack and Sankoff's (1988) typology as guide in answering the question, the categorizing the Tagalog-English code-switching strategies in electronic mails, she gave examples for each of the categories defined by Poplack and Sankoff. The first category of Poplack and Sankoff was smooth code-switches. These code-switches involve "changing the language of the sentence only at syntactic boundaries which occur in both languages" (Poplack & Sankoff, 1988, p. 1175). Switches of this type include switches between a main clause and a noun clause, an adverbial clause, a relative clause, and coordinate clauses, switches to a prepositional phrase in the other language, and switches between a Tagalog verb and an English subject. Here are some of the examples that Bautista provided for this strategy[3]:

1. Yesterday afternoon he felt so bad he said that *mas gusto pa daw niyang ipaputol na ang kamay niya*. 'Yesterday afternoon, he felt so bad he said that *he would prefer to have his hand cut off*.' (Between a main clause and a noun clause)
2. Saturday afternoon my ML [mother-in-law] called to say we should go to Nene's house, kahit wala si Nene. 'Saturday afternoon my ML [mother-in-law] called to say we should go to Nene's house, *even though Nene and family weren't there*." (Between a main clause and an adverbial clause)
3. Isa pa si Caroline *who has to grow a spine*. 'Caroline is another *who has to grow a spine*.' (Between a main clause and a relative clause)
4. They tried Alabang Hills, *pero hanggang bewang daw sa tapat ng Benedictine*. 'They tried Alabang Hills, *but it was waist-deep in front of Benedictine*.' (Between a main clause and a coordinate clause)
5. Bising-bisi sila *because of the convenience store*. 'They're very, very busy *because of the convenience store*.' (To a prepositional phrase in the other language)
6. Nakakatense your statement *that he likes fast cars and girls*. 'Makes us tense *that he likes fast cars and girls*.' Between a Tagalog verb and an English subject)

The second strategy that Poplack and Sankoff (1988) identified and that Bautista (1998a) searched in her electronic mails was constituent insertion – "simply the insertion of a grammatical constituent, in a sentence of the other language" (Poplack & Sankoff, 1988, p. 1176). Appearing as tag expressions, enclitics, and the Tagalog adverbial *parang* 'like' in her data, this strategy was exemplified by Bautista using the following excerpts from the electronic mails:

---

[3] The structure in question is in italics and the closest translation possible (for the entire sentence) is provided after the entire sentence.

7. *Oo nga pala*, is anyone traveling around September 10-14? '*Oh by the way*, is anyone traveling around September 10-14? (Tag expression)
8. We'll probably get it back Tuesday or Wednesday next week *na*. 'We'll probably get it back Tuesday or Wednesday next week *already*.' (Tagalog enclitic adverbial)
9. They couldn't rouse the guy: *Parang* dead to the world; drug-induced sleep daw. 'They couldn't rouse the guy: *He seemed* dead to the world; drug-induced sleep, they said.'

The last strategy Bautista (1998) found existent in her data is nonce borrowing or:

> single lexical items, syntactically and morphologically (if not always phonologically) integrated into the recipient language, but also because eligible words are of the same type: largely nouns, with some representation of other content words (verbs, adverbs and adjectives), but no pronouns, articles, prepositions or other function words. (Poplack & Sankoff, 1988, p. 1176)

Poplack (1980) clarifies that these items are not established loanwords and that the former differs from the latter in terms of frequency of use, degree of acceptance, level of phonological integration, and the like, with the former being less frequent, less accepted, and less integrated. The extract below exemplifies the borrowing of a Tagalog noun in an English sentence:

10. I thought she would be a *kunsintidora* because she allows her 14-year old daughter to have a boy friend. 'I thought she would be someone who consents too easily because she allows her 14-year old daughter to have a boy friend.'

Adjectives are also a common bowworing:

11. And the same personality too – very *malambing* and *mabait*. 'And the same personality too – very *demonstrative* and *kind*.'

Idioms are also borrowed in either languages, but here is an example of an English idiom borrowed into Tagalog:

12. Tetong, *welcome to the club* ka nab a ulit? 'Tetong, are you once again *welcome to the club*?'

The English verb *make* followed by another Tagalog verb was also seen to be common in Bautista's data, such as this one:

13. If I didn't *make kulit*, for sure we won't have the phone yet. 'If I didn't *nag*, we won't have the phone yet.

However, this construction – along with some others – could be considered as an instance of what Bautista referred to as "*maarteng* English" (p. 139) or English with affectation, as

there are clear and easily available equivalents to these borrowings but the speakers and writers nevertheless made a conscious switch, for some pragmatic and stylistic reasons.

Bautista (1998a) also illustrated the smooth integration of these borrowings through the use of inflections of the host language in the borrowings:

14. Thanks for all the *kwentos*. 'Thanks for all the *stories*.' (English plural inflection in a Tagalog word)
15. Mike and I are so depressed by the turn of events, sana naman *magkaturn-around*. 'Mike and I are so depressed by the turn of events, hopefully *there will be a turn-around*.' (Tagalog affixation in an English word)

Bautista (1998a) found no instance of the third of Poplack and Sankoff's (1988) strategies in code-switching; non-smooth switching, that is. According to Poplack and Sankoff, this strategy also called flagged switching "are marked at the discourse level by pauses, hesitation phenomena, metalinguistic commentary, and other means of drawing attention to the switch, with the resultof interrupting the smooth production of the sentence at the switch point" (p. 1176). Bautista never found any instance of this in her data but she gave this hypothetical example, one that she would say in the company of her foreign friends:

16. As we say in Tagalog: *Sayang*! What a pity!

Table 2 now presents the forms of Tagalog-English code-switching in the data, following the typology proposed by Poplack and Sankoff (1988), and as applied by Bautista (1998a) in her dataset of electronic mails:

Table 2
Forms of Tagalog-English Code-Switching in the Data

Class	Form								Total
	Smooth Code-Switching		Constituent Insertion		Non-Smooth Switching		Nonce Borrowing		
	f	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	
1	28	80.00	4	11.43	0	0.00	3	8.57	35
2	4	80.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5
3	2	33.33	4	66.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	6
4	11	40.74	15	55.56	1	3.70	0	0.00	27
5	5	83.33	1	16.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	6
6	1	50.00	1	50.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2
7	8	80.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	20.00	10
8	3	37.50	0	0.00	3	37.50	2	25.00	8
9	10	90.91	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	11
10	11	84.62	2	15.38	0	0.00	0	0.00	13
11	7	87.50	1	12.50	0	0.00	0	0.00	8
12	82	86.32	4	4.21	1	1.05	8	8.42	95
13	20	71.43	7	25.00	1	3.57	0	0.00	28
14	68	86.08	9	11.39	0	0.00	2	2.53	79
Total	260	78.08	49	14.71	6	1.80	18	5.41	333
Average	19	78.08	4	14.71	0	1.80	1	5.41	24

In Table 2, it is obvious that Tagalog-English code-switching in the data are most in the form of – or strategy – smooth-code-switching, at almost four-fifth of the total number of code-switches in the data. Constituent insertion follows – but very, very from smooth switching – and they total to almost 50 instances or almost 15%. Nonce borrowings and non-smooth switches are relatively few, the former appearing only close to 20 instances or a little over five percent while the latter appearing only a little over five instances or almost two percent. And on the average, a class discourse would have almost 20 smooth switches, almost 5 constituent insertions, and just one nonce borrowing. Non-smooth switching is not common to the sample. In fact, only four classes recorded instances of this strategy, with one class monopolizing this strategy producing three of the six instances of non-smooth switches in the data. The cases of non-smooth switches will be discussed a little later, after each strategy is exemplified one by one below:

The use of the strategies in the sample of English language classes in Metro Quezon City, the Philippines do not differ significantly from how they were used in Bautista's (1998a) sample. Perhaps, because, as Bautista herself as thought, though her data is – to some extent – a written record of communication, it is not primarily formal and lean more closely to being conversational in form. And classroom discourse, though formal in context, would still more likely proceed to be more conversational in form. Hence, the similarity of the code-switches found in Bautista's data and the present study's. Therefore, not much elaboration will be given for the three most frequent strategies but, at least for the purposes of presentation, samples from the English language classes analyzed are provided below:

Under the typology smooth code-switches, sentences in Tagalog from the first word down to the last word were all counted as smooth code-switches, since the context is understandably in English and so even a Tagalog-only utterance was considered to be a code-switch, an inter-sentential code-switch, perhaps. Most of the smooth switches are of this form and here are a few examples:

17. Teacher: Okay. Paul mops the floor during Saturday. Who else? Merille.
    Student: Teacher, *may nag-away po*. 'Teacher, *someone got caught in a fight*.'
18. Student 1: *Anong color?* 'What color?'
    Student 2: Blue.
19. Teacher: Mark Anthony. Mmm. Alright. Very good. Next, next.
    Student: Ma'am, *'di pa ako natatwag*. 'Ma'am, *I have not been called yet*.'

Other instances of smooth switches have taken the form of repetitions:

20. Make it fast! *Bilisan mo*! 'Make it fast! *You make it fast*!'
21. Why is this with correction already? We haven't checked. *Ba't may mga check na'to? Hindi pa tayo nagtse-scheck eh*. 'Why is this with correction already? We haven't checked. *Why does this already have corrections? We haven't checked [it]*.'
22. Ah, so you'd like to know what else? Ano pa ang gusto mong malaman diyaan? 'Ah, so you'd like to know what else? *What else would you like to know about that?*'

Here are more examples of smooth switching:

23. Hello! Listen, children. *Alam ko gutom na kayo!* 'Hello! Listen, children. *I know you are already hungry.*'
24. Be careful! *Andito ang pandikit ninyo, o.* ' Be careful! *Your glue is here.*'
25. *So babasahin lahat?* '*So everything will be read?*'

The second most frequent strategy of code-switching in the English language classes data is constituent insertions. Below are some examples of constituent insertion in the teacher language corpus analyzed:

26. Okay... Now... *Sige*... Please be the next... 'Okay... Now... *Go*... Be the next...'
27. Just raise your hand *lang*. 'Just raise your hand *only*.'
28. *Uy*! Sit down *nga eh*. '*Hey*! *The teacher* said sit down.'

The first two examples also parallel some of the examples in Bautista's (1998a) paper. However, the third case counts as a rather unique case because the English free translation already has a subject. This is because, according to Dita (personal communication, 2008), one of the functions of the Tagalog adverbial particle *nga* is being a particle of reiteration; thus, there is no need for the student who uttered the sentence to indicate an explicit subject, given the context that the teacher just gave the order to sit down. Obviously, this is an example of intersentential conde-switching.

The two least frequent strategies of Tagalog-English code-switching found in the current data are nonce borrowing and non-smooth code-switching. There are basically two reasons why the teachers and students borrowed words from Tagalog: One is because the word being borrowed has no (close, semantic) equivalent in English and/or the speaker wants to achieve some pragmatic and even perhaps stylistic effect to which only the Tagalog word could bring out. Here are some examples of nonce borrowings:

29. Ginger is also an example of herb. Some plants cling to the wall or climb terraces. Okay, they are called vines. What are examples of vines according to our story? Oh yes, Santsy. Vines, kalabasa. Read. Read it. Okay. Patola. Okay, next – shrubs. What do you call shrubs – a woody plant in a tree? Oh, Sophia. 'Ginger is also an example of herb. Some plants cling to the wall or climb terraces. Okay, they are called vines. What are examples of vines according to our story? Oh yes, Santsy. Vines. Squash. Read. Read it. Okay. *Sponge gourd*. Okay, next – shrubs. What do you call shrubs – a woody plant in a tree? Oh, Sophia.'
30. Students: Good morning, visitor!
    Teacher and Students: Welcome...
    Students: And *mabuhay*! [Tagalog welcome greeting with no English translation]
31. Okay, you are going to write the correct answer. Number one. Read first the sentence before answering. Read first the sentence. Answer number one. Will you take your seat? Just raise your hand. Jasper. Yes, *hija*? Read the first sentence. Hmmm. Read. [An affectionate term (originally from Spanish) to refer to a girl]

Actually, the above borrowings may already considered part of the lexicon of English – Philippine English, that is, following Bautista (1997, 1998b) and Borlongan (2007). Borlongan may even go as far as considering these borrowings as already being part of Standard Philippine English.

In Bautista's (1998a) data composed of electronic mails, there was no instance of non-smooth switching. She explained this phenomenon as being a reflection of code-switching as a natural mode of discourse for the Manila speech community – the community in which her subjects belong. However, in the data analyzed for this study, there is at least almost two percent of all the code-switches that could be categorized as non-smooth switch. This should not be too surprising – even if the setting from which the present data was derived is an English language class – because Bautista's data were all electronic mails and they may have undergone some self-editing and superficial screening of the author, as Bautista herself has described her data. The current data is rather more spontaneous, in terms of production. Both the teachers and the students have little time to check on the accuracy of their utterances before production and would only resort to correction upon noticing of error. Hence, the instances of non-smooth switching. In fact, one class monopolized this strategy, taking half of the total number of all the non-smooth code-switches in the data. Their instances are rather not too much, only a little over five times in the data. Here are some of its occurrences:

32. Yesterday. Now... Okay... Sige... Now, let us change the names with your real names. And let us change yesterday by last Saturday. What did you do last Saturday? Okay, I need two girls. Okay, Christine Joy and Shane. Okay, shane will be Dolly and Christine Joy will be... *Ay*... Christine Joy will be Joy. Okay. And change this one to last Saturday. Okay, Shane, what did you do last Saturday, Joy? 'Yesterday. Now... Okay... Okay... Now, let us change the names with your real names. And let us change yesterday by last Saturday. What did you do last Saturday? Okay, I need two girls. Okay, Christine Joy and Shane. Okay, shane will be Dolly and Christine Joy will be... *Oh*... Christine Joy will be Joy. Okay. And change this one to last Saturday. Okay, Shane, what did you do last Saturday, Joy?'
33. Okay, who'd like to pick one? May I call on? Yes, Kyle, come here. You pick one word inside the box and you do the action. Do not show your *ano*, okay? O, take a look at Kyle. 'Okay, who'd like to pick one? May I call on? Yes, Kyle, come here. You pick one word inside the box and you do the action. Do not show your *what*, okay? O, take a look at Kyle'
34. Yung *ano*, yung book with this drawing. It's on page 172. This book, with this kind of drawing. O, you look at the drawing ha. It is on page 172. 'The *what*, the book with this drawing. It's on page 172. This book, with this kind of drawing. Okay, you look at the drawing. It is on page 172.'

Summary and Conclusion

Shrouded by questions on code-switching in the context of English language classes in the Philippines, this study analyzed a total of 14 English language classes whose discourses have already been transcribed and compiled in a teacher language corpus. The analysis focused on the frequency of teachers' and students' code-switches in those classes as well as the forms of the code-switches of both the teachers and students. The analysis of

the data reveals that most English language teachers in the sample (11 out of 14 or 78.57%) code-switch – and therefore "violate" the implementing policy – and they code-switch in around less than 5 to almost fifty utterances or a little less than fifteen, at the average, in the entire class session. students also have their share of code-switching in class sessions. All classes recorded at least more than one instance of code-switched utterances. However, though the instances of code-switching could be claimed to be significant, one's tendency to code-switch is more of an individual-specific trait. Tagalog-English code-switching in the data are most in the form of – or strategy – smooth-code-switching, at almost four-fifth of the total number of code-switches in the data. Constituent insertion follows but very, very from smooth switching. Nonce borrowings and non-smooth switches are relatively few.

References

Bautista, M. L. S. (1997). The lexicon of Philippine English. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context (Proceedings of the Conference held in Manila on August 2-3, 1996)* (pp. 49-72). Manila, the Philippines: Macquarie Library Pty Ltd.

Bautista, M. L. S. (1998a). Another look at Tagalog-English code-switching. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Pagtanaw: Essays on language in honor of Teodoro A Llamzon* (pp. 121-146). Manila, the Philippines: The Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Bautista, M. L. S. (1998b). Tagalog-English code-switching and the lexicon of Philippine English. *Asian Englishes*, 1(1), 51-67.

Bautista, M. L. S. (1999). An analysis of the functions of Tagalog-English code switching: Data from one case. In M. L. S. Bautista & G. O. Tan (Eds.), *The Filipino bilingual: A multidisciplinary perspective (Festschrift in honor of Emy M. Pascasio)* (pp. 19-31). Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Bautista, M. L. S. (2000). *Defining Standard Philippine English: Its status and grammatical features*. Manila, the Philippines: De La Salle University Press, Inc.

Bautista, M. L. S. (2004). Tagalog-English code switching as a mode of discourse. *Asia Pacific Education Review* 5, 226-233.

Bernardo, A. B. I. (2005). Bilingual code-switching as a resource for learning and teaching: Alternative reflections on the language and education issue in the Philippines. In D. T. Dayag & J. S. Quakenbush (Eds.), *Linguistics and language education in the Philippines and beyond: A festschrift in honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista* (pp. 151-169). Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Bernardo, A. B. I. (2007). Language in Philippine education: Rethinking old fallacies, exploring new alternatives amidst globalization. In T. R. F. Tupas (Ed.), *(Re)making society: The politics of language, discourse, and identity in the Philippines* (pp. 1-26). Quezon City, the Philippines: The University of the Philippines Press.

Bernardo, A. B. I. (in press). Language, learning, and medium of instruction in multilingual contexts: An information-processing components perspective. In U. Kim & Y.-S. Park (Eds.), *Asia's educational miracle: Psychological, cognitive, and cultural perspectives*. New York: Springer Publishing.

Borlongan, A. M. (2007). Innovations in Standard Philippine English. In C. C. Mann (Ed.), *Current research on English and applied linguistics: A De La Salle University*

special issue (pp. 1-36). Manila, the Philippines: Department of English and Applied Linguistics, De La Salle University-Manila.

Cole, S. (1998). The use of L1 in communicative English classrooms. *The Language Teacher* 22, 11-13.

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal* 50(4), 303-311.

Gordon, R. G., Jr. (Ed.). (2005). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (15th ed.) [Electronic version]. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Gumperz, J. J. (1977). The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching. *RELC Journal* 8(2), 1-34.

Kachru, B. B. (1997). English as an Asian language. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context (Proceedings of the conference held in Manila on August 2-3, 1996)* (pp. 1-23). Manila, the Philippines: The Macquarie Library Pty Ltd.

Lieberson, S. (1981). An asymmetrical approach to segregation. In C. Peach, V. Robinson, & S. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnic segregation in cities* (pp. 61-82). London: Croom-Helm.

Martin, I. P. (2006a). Language in Philippine classrooms: Enfeebling or enabling? *Asian Englishes* 9(2), 48-66.

Martin, I. P. (2006b). Code-switching practices in tertiary-level courses. *PSSC Social Science Information* 34, 123-140.

Mattsson, A., & Burenhult-Mattsson, N. (1999). Code-switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers* 47, 59-72.

McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (2001). *Corpus linguistics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

The New London Group. (2000). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 9-37). London: Routledge.

Pascasio, E. M. (1978). Dynamics of code switching in the business domain. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 9, 40-50.

Pineda, P. B. P. (1985). Pagpaplano ng wika ukol sa pambansang pagsulong. In A. O. Alfonso (Ed.), *Linggwistika at panitikan: Mga piling sanaysay handog-parangal para kay Al Q. Perez* (pp. 84-106). Manila, the Philippines: Rex Book Store & Pambansang Samahan sa Linggwistikang Pilipino.

Poplack, S. V. (1980). "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español": Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18, 561-618.

Poplack, S. V., & Sankoff, D. (1988). Code-switching. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, & K. Mattheier (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society* (Vol. 2, pp. 1173-1180). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Santos, E. H. (1969). *A study on the roles of aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language acquisition.* Unpublished master's thesis, Philippine Normal College, Manila, the Philippines.

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal* XI(8).

Sibayan, B. P. (2000). Resulting patterns of sociolinguistic, socioeconomic, and cultural practice and behavior after more than four hundred years of language policy and practice in the Philippines. In M. L. S. Bautista, T. A. Llamzon, & B. P. Sibayan

(Eds.), *Parangal cang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his sixtieth birthday* (pp. 247-261). Manila, the Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

About the Author

Ariane Macalinga Borlongan is a doctoral candidate at the Department of English and Applied Linguistics of De La Salle University, Manila, the Philippines. His interests are on Philippine English and world Englishes, English grammar, sociolinguistics, educational leadership and management, and language teaching and learning.