A Study on Patterns and Functions of Tagalog-English Code-Switching in Two Oral Discussions

Eden Regala Flores*
De La Salle University, Philippines

Abstract

Following Hamers and Blanc's (2000) main types of codeswitching (CS) and Bautista's (1999) framework on functions of CS, two distinct sources of data were used to identify and analyze various code switches made by the three female college freshman students during their group discussion, and the two adults (male and female) engaged in a 2-hour audio-taped recording of a one-on-one interview. Results of the study reveal that codeswitching in both groups occurred at the inter-sentential, extra-sentential, and intra-sentential levels. The present study also validates D'Souza's Competence-related Code-Mixing (CM) (where a person's competence in L2 is low and therefore has to go back to L1) and Culture-related CM (where a person uses terms and expressions in the heritage language that may not have an accurate translation in another language). In light of these findings, pedagogical implications especially in the Philippine language education contexts are given.

Keywords: code-switching; face-to-face communications; language variation; oral discussions; Tagalog-English.

Introduction

Code-switching (henceforth, C-S), or "the use of two or more linguistic varieties in the same conversation or interaction" (Scotton & Ury, 1977, in Bamiro, 2006, p. 23), in the Philippines is a common sociolinguistic phenomenon. It is so prevalent that we no longer consider *Tag-lish* or *Eng-log* (respectively for Tagalog-English or English-Tagalog) in a derogatory fashion to describe a person's manner of speaking. In some domains, however, such as schools, mass media and the World Wide Web, business and commerce, or government offices, C-S "may be disfavored, less acceptable or looked down upon for political, social or cultural reasons" (Baker, 2006, p.109). It may be regarded as a form of disloyalty between different ethnic groups where language may be perceived as a prime marker of separate identity, power distinction, or social hierarchy (Baker, 2006). It may also be viewed as a sign of discourtesy in both formal and informal conversations especially if one of the interlocutors does not understand the language the other party

---

* Email: eden.flores@dlsu.edu.ph. Address: 2401 Taft Avenue, Malate 1004, Manila, Philippines.

switches to. These perceptions and attitudes prevail despite the growing awareness that "those who are more fluent in a language have a tendency to code-switch" (Meisel, 2004, in Baker, 2006, p.109).

Nevertheless, Baker (2001) has argued that by instinct, most proficient bilinguals use C-S as a linguistic tool to communicate their ideas. As such, occurrences in C-S may be at inter-sentential, extra-sentential, and intra-sentential levels, which will be discussed in detail in the review of literature section.

This distinction in the use of English and Tagalog affirms the observation that in diglossic societies where two languages exist side by side within a geographical area (Fishman, 1972, 1980), "the language community is unlikely to use one language for exactly the same purpose" (Baker, 2006, p. 69) and that this community assigns (either consciously or unconsciously) specialization of functions between different languages (Fishman, 1980). According to Baker (2006), "the use of," for example, Tagalog, in a situation where English is expected is "typically embarrassing or belittling" (p. 70). However, he also stated that C-S is "a valuable linguistic tool" (p.109) which demonstrates a bilingual's full use of language resources available to him, usually knowing that the listener fully understands the code-switches. He has posited that C-S does not happen by chance. A bilingual person is driven by a purpose and logic whenever he switches codes. Myers-Scotton's (1990) Markedness Model has stated that code-switching is "a negotiation of position, and people code-switch because of personal motivations" (in Bautista, 1999, p. 26). Bautista (1999) has further explained that "this model is a restatement of Poplack's (1980) comment that C-S is an over-all discourse mode and it is `the choice (or not) of this mode which is of significance to the participants rather than the choice of switch points'" (p. 26). Within this context of over-all code-switching, Bautista (1999, p. 26) has proposed that "communicative efficiency—the fastest, easiest, most effective way of saying something" — is the answer to the question: *Why do bilinguals switch here in this particular place rather than there?*

Review of Literature

Gumperz (1982) has defined C-S as "…the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or sub-systems" (p. 59). In other words, C-S is the alternate use of two or more languages within a stretch of discourse or an utterance. A shared common knowledge of at least a similar pair of languages by the interlocutors is a condition for C-S. Although perceived negatively particularly by monolingual speakers to be a sign of linguistic deficit, language interference or lack of mastery of both languages, many view it as "a valuable linguistic tool" (Baker, 2004, p. 109). According to Beardsmore (1982), C-S "is not arbitrary but rule-governed, and depends on factors such as topic, code being used, situation and participants" (p. 42), whereas Blom and Gumperz (1972) talk of two triggers: *situational code-switching* (i.e.,

relating to a change in the situation or topic) and *conversational code-switching* (i.e., when there is no change in the situation or topic).

Various terms have been used to describe switches between languages in both oral and written discourses. According to Baker (2006), "code-mixing is sometimes used to describe changes at the word level and a mixed language sentence" (p. 111). He has argued, however, that generally speaking, C-S occurs when two interlocutors switch codes whether at word, sentence or discourse levels.

According to Hamers and Blanc (2000, pp, 259-260) and Poplack (1980), there are three main types of C-S:

1. Inter-sentential C-S where there is "…switch at clause/sentence boundary, one clause being in one language, the other clause in the other…"

    e.g., "So *tapos na tayo* (we are done) we made this already"

2. Extra-sentential (or tag) C-S where"…the insertion of a tag, e.g. 'you know', I mean', from one language into an utterance which is entirely in another language."

    e.g., "I think it's a given, '*lam mo yun* (you know that)."

3. Intra-sentential C-S "…where switches of different types occur within the clause boundary, including within the word boundary…"

    e.g., "*Tapos magko*-concentrate *tayo sa* drinking (Then we will concentrate on drinking)."

Morever, scholars have identified some instances when it may not be possible to switch codes. *The free morpheme constraint* (Poplack, 1980; Sankoff & Poplack, 1981) predicts that a switch cannot occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless the latter has been phonologically integrated into the language of the former (i.e., borrowing). *The equivalence constraint* (Hamers & Blanc, 2000) "…predicts that the order of sentence constituents immediately adjacent to and on both sides of the switch must be grammatical with respect to both languages simultaneously" (p. 261). This is problematic though in terms of its universality because of the perceived differences in the grammatical categories of various languages. *The Matrix Language Frame Model* (Myers-Scotton, 2002, in Baker, 2006) claims that every act of C-S has a base and/or dominant language (Matrix Language; ML), in which element(s) of an Embedded Language (EL) is/are inserted and that ML "provides the grammatical frame or rules for grammar" (p. 109). She further claims that C-S is bound by rules (e.g., word order, verb endings) governing the use of secondary language, as its insertions will fit those ML rules.

Baker (2006) has hypothesized that whenever C-S is prevalent in a language group, it may be "regarded as a sign that the minority language is about to disappear or becomes a key indicator of the health of a minority language" (p.109). For example, if the matrix language is Kapampangan (one of the major languages in the Philippines) and there are Tagalog insertions, this indicator for the future of Kapampangan will be positive. However,

following Baker's (2006) arguments, if the grammatical frame is Tagalog, this indicator for Kapampangan may be negative.

It is very seldom that bilinguals keep their two (or three in some cases) languages completely separate (Baker, 2006). The ways bilinguals mix them are complex and varied. To reiterate, C-S varies according to who is/are engaged in a conversation, what is being discussed, and in what situation or context the conversation takes place. The interlocutors are constantly negotiating languages, topics or meaning in their conversations. Political, social, economic, cultural, and symbolic factors can influence C-S (Treffers-Daller, 1992, 1994; Stroud, 2004, in Baker, 2006).

D'Souza (1992) claims that there are three kinds of code-switching (code-mixing/CM in her study):

1. *Competence-related CM* – where a person's competence in L2 is low and therefore has to go back to L1,
2. *Communicative CM* – where a person's proficiency in two languages makes it easy for him/her to shift from one language to another, and
3. *Culture-related CM* – where a person uses terms and expressions in L2 that cannot be expressed in L1.

Based on D'Souza's classification, Bautista (1999) proposes her own:

1. *Deficiency-driven C-S* – occurs when a person is not competent in L2 and therefore has to shift back to L1, and
2. *Proficiency-driven C-S* – occurs when a person's competence in both languages makes him/her decide to switch for a more effective/proficient way to express an idea.

Other than these, C-S can be used to emphasize a particular point, clarify a point, reinforce a request, substitute a word, and/or express a concept that does not have direct equivalence in the other language. It can also be used for wider sociolinguistic reasons: indicating solidarity; humor; signaling a change of attitude or relationship; and/or including or excluding someone from the conversation (see Baker, 2006, p.111-112).

Based on Bautista's (1999) findings, the driving force behind code-switching among bilinguals is communicative efficiency. The following are the proposed four sets of specific evidence to support her claim:

1. Insertion of Tagalog adverbial enclitics can communicate an idea more quickly and more easily, for example:

She just forgot *pala* to return the chair to her cubicle.

In English, this would translate into "It turns out that she forgot to return the chair to her cubicle," which would make it longer and less efficient.

2. Insertion of content words which refer to cultural items facilitates communicative efficiency, for example:

We need to buy some *pasalubong* (gifts from travel) before relatives from the U.S. fly back home.

This content word may have translation equivalents, but not the exact equivalent in terms of emotional nuance or even referential meaning (Bautista, 1999).

3. Use of idioms where availability of metaphorical expressions in the other language facilitates communication, for example:

Marami siyang bala! (Literally: He has many bullets. Figuratively: He has hidden talents/skills/potentials/surprises.)

Lalaki ulo nun! (Lit.: His head will swell. Fig.: He might become a braggart.)

These metaphorical expressions seem to be pre-packaged expressions, or ready-made structures easily available for use as punch lines which lose their meanings when translated into other languages.

4. Use of linguistic play where a speaker code-switches to be able to play with the word, for example:

Kikitain mo ba'ng *papa* mo ngayon?

It seems that the speaker switched to English to be able to play with the English word, *papa,* to mean someone special.

Using Hamers and Blanc's (2000) main types of C-S and Bautista's (1999) framework, I attempted to examine the patterns and functions of Tagalog-English code-switching using excerpts from two focus group discussions. Specifically, this study was conducted to answer the following questions:

1. What are the patterns of Tagalog-English code-switching?
2. Why do speakers code-switch in their verbal production?

Methodology

Data Sources

The first source of data was a 1-hour audio-taped recording of a study group composed of three female freshman students (aged 17-18) who were enrolled in my Freshman English One course at the time of the investigation. The transcription of this data was done by the researcher's assistant and was validated as accurate by the author and the two inter-coders involved in this study.

The second source of data was a 2-hour audio-taped recording of a one-on-one interview on the interviewee's preferred brands of beverages/drinks and her buying and drinking habits. The recording transpired at the interviewee's home in a Tagalog-speaking urban area within Metro Manila. The recording was transcribed by the company's research team and was likewise validated as accurate by the researcher.

Participants

The first source of data was participated in by three female freshman college students who volunteered to record their study group discussion when the class was asked for willing participants to take part in the present study. After receiving explicit explanation and instructions about the nature and processes of the study, they agreed to meet at a specified time and place for the recording. The participants did not receive any credits in class nor any monetary compensation for volunteering to do the task.

Based on the personal data sheet they filled out, all three obtained their primary and secondary education from co-educational private institutions located within the metropolis. Their English and Tagalog language proficiency levels (i.e., English/Tagalog listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills) range from fairly competent to poorly competent (see Tables 1 & 2). Students 1 (S1) and 2 (S2) have Tagalog as their first language and English as their second language. The third student (S3) has English as a first language and Tagalog as a second language. All have resided within the metropolis since birth and were born into professional and educated families.

The second source of data used in this paper involved two participants – the interviewee (M) and the interviewer (R). M is a 35-year old married woman and a mother of three children aged 15, 12, and 10. Although she is a medical technology graduate from one of the private universities in Manila, she does not practice her profession. Instead, she works as a freelance real estate broker and a manager of her own party needs company and family's doors of apartments. She speaks Manila Tagalog (very competently) being born and raised in the city, and claimed that she is fairly competent in the English language. R is a 43-year old senior staff member at a research company commissioned by an advertising firm to do research on consumers' perceptions and preferences of beverages sold in the market. He considers himself very competent in Bikolano (first language), English (second language), and Tagalog (third language). Table 1 and Table 2 show linguistic repertoires of all participants.

The consent of the interviewee was sought prior to the recording. The advertising company paid her (in cash and a basket of grocery items was given to her) for participating in this discussion. Food and drinks were also provided during the interview.

Table 1.

Levels of English Competence of the Participants in Both Groups

	4 (Very competent)	3 (Fairly competent)	2 (Poorly competent)	1 (Not at all competent)
Group I				
Student 1		X		
Student 2		X		
Student 3		X		

Group II				
Interviewee		X		
Interviewer	X			

Table 2.

Levels of Tagalog Competence of the Participants in Both Groups

	4 (Very competent)	3 (Fairly competent)	2 (Poorly competent)	1 (Not at all competent)
Group I				
Student 1	X			
Student 2		X		
Student 3			X	
Group II				
Interviewee	X			
Interviewer	X			

Data Analysis/Coding

The patterns of C-S occurrences in both sources of data were coded and analysed following Hammers and Blanc's (2000) main types of C-S. In determining the functions of C-S used by the participants in both sources, the analysis was informed by Bautista's (1999) explanations on when and why Filipinos code-switch.

The researcher solicited the assistance of two other inter-coders who were given an orientation and practice sets prior to the actual coding of the data. Discrepancies in the coding were resolved by reviewing the definitions and characteristics of the various patterns and functions of code-switching and an agreement of 93% was reached as a result.

Findings and Discussion

What are the patterns of Tagalog-English code-switching?

The C-S as used by the participants in this study reveal that they occur in various levels as identified by Hamers and Blanc (2000). Excerpts from the data are provided to illustrate key points and findings. Loose translations of the Tagalog utterances are in parentheses.

Patterns of Tagalog-English Code-Switching

1. Inter-sentential C-S

Study Group:

S1: Okay guys. So *tapos na tayo* (So we are done) we made this already. *Nakagawa na tayo ng* (We already made some)

S1: *Na napasagutan na*. (That they already have been filled out) 60 respondents *'to* (These are 60 respondents) So what do you think?

    S2: You should make more questions. *Yun lang* (that's it)

  S1: So what's our purpose? *Ano ba gusto nating alamin dito*? (What do we want to know here)

      Interview:

M: *Pagka yung, halimbawa kung hindi ba masyadong maganda ang pakiramdam mo, parang* you don't feel like drinking… (Like, for example, if you don't really feel good about yourself it seems like *you don't feel like drinking…*

Based on the above excerpts, C-S occurs at the clause/sentence boundary, with one clause being in Tagalog, *tapos na tayo* (we are done) and the other clause in English (we made this already). Likewise, the interviewer switches at the sentence level when he said in Tagalog, '… hindi ka masyadong maganda ang pakiramdam mo, parang (…you really do not feel good about yourself and it seems like…), then shifts into English when he said, '…you don't feel like drinking…'

2. *Extra-sentential (or tag)*

      Study Group:

  S2: No, *di ba ang* purpose eh *ano yung nga* about aggression. How *ano Parang ano* the use of drinking as an oral aggression. Pero di ba now we are deciding to p*arang* to combine, integrate *ang* defense mechanism with oral aggression.

(No, isn't it that our purpose is what that's it about aggression. How what. It's like the use of drinking…aggression. But isn't it that now we are deciding to it like combine, integrates the defense…)

      Interview:

  M: *Ayan*, reunions. Usually reunion *talaga*, para sabi may *yun* mga guys rin diyan, most of the time beer ang gusto nila, *di ba*? Yan, syempre mapapainom ka na rin, pero hindi ako *talagang ganun*. Pero meron akong   na try Red Horse. *Grabe naman*, hindi ako makakatulog. *Ayan*, bibili ako, pero hindi madalas dahil talagang masyadong mapait. Konti lang ang inom mo *yun* at *parang* may tama ka, naantukin ka talaga.

      R: *Yun*, talaga malakas ang sipa.

Extra-sentential C-S occurs here where S2's *di ba, ano yung nga, parang ano,* and R's *ayan talaga, talagang ganun, yun,* and *talaga* are considered Tagalog variants of the tag "you know" or "I mean" were inserted in the clauses or utterances.

3. *Intra-sentential C-S*

      Study Group:

S1: *Bale* oral aggression *naman talaga ang* topic *natin*. *Tapos magko*-concentrate *tayo sa* drinking, *tapos yung* drinking *ili*-link *natin sa* defense mechanism. Since we want to know what, why they drink. So if, *parang ano na lang*, how oral aggression becomes a defense mechanism.

(It's like it is really oral aggression is our topic then we will concentrate on drinking, then that we will link drinking to defense mechanism mechanism…Since…drink So if, it looks like it's like this, how…mechanism)

        Interview:

M: Ayan pagka yung, ano minsan *mago-offer* din ako ng coffee sa mga friends. Sa bata hindi rin masyado. (Like that, if like what sometimes I also offer coffee to my friends. To the children, not so often)

R: Ah hindi rin, bakit po hindi *nago-offer* sa mga bata? (Ah, you don't also, why do you not offer it to the children)

M: Hindi, kasi ina-ano ko pang matanda talaga ang coffee, pero meron naman instances na pagka nakabili ko yung mga mixes na ano, yung mga cappuccino, kasi may mga ganun. Pero ang Brand X kasi ano, kasi minsan merong ganun ganun mga mixes, nag-aano ako, *nagne-Nescafe*, kasi meron silang mga variations na ganun, at tsaka masarap. Yun, pwede sila, pero once in a while, para 'man matikman din nila yun.

(No, because I think that coffee is for adults but there are instances when I have bought these mixes that are like cappuccino, because there are like those. But the Brand X is like because sometimes they have something like that like those mixes then I go for Nescafe because they have variations like those and they're delicious. There, they can drink it but once in a while so they can taste them also

In excerpt 3, we can see clearly how S1 switches to an intra-sentential level where the students' formulations of *magko*-concentrat*e* and *ili*-link, and both M and R's switches of *mago-offer, nago-offer,* and *nagne-Nescafe* (for to offer, is offering, and will drink Nescafe, respectively) occur within the clause boundary, including within the word boundary. In all instances, the speakers attempted to communicate their ideas by combining the bound morphemes (e.g., magko-, mago-, nago-, and nagne-) which signal present and future tenses of the verbs to some lexical items like nouns (e.g., link, offer, Nescafe). Hence, the speakers extend the meanings of these nouns by making them function like verbs as seen in the excerpts cited above.

Why do speakers code-switch in their verbal production?

Functions of C-S

According to Myers-Scotton's (1990) Markedness Model, C-S is a negotiation of position, and people code-switch because of personal motivations. Bautista (1999) has argued that this is a restatement of Poplack's (1980) comment given earlier that C-S "is an overall discourse mode and it is 'the choice (or not) of this mode which is of significance to the participants rather than the choice of switch points'" (p. 26). Bautista has further explored this idea by asking the question, *Why switch here in this particular place rather than there?* Her simple answer to this question is communicative efficiency—the fastest, easiest, most

effective way of saying something. I attempted to validate her proposed answer and four sets of evidence using my two sources of data:

Function Words

Tagalog function words or adverbial enclitics when inserted in English sentences can usually communicate an idea more quickly and more easily. Here are some examples:

S2: Ok fine let's say … let's not say *na lang* (just) how oral regression becomes the defense mechanism. Let's say how would drinking become the defense mechanism?

S1: Becomes a defense mechanism We hope we will *parang* (it seems like) We will consider this something with outmost …

S2:   Oh *hindi parang* answer this survey seriously so that we have... *ano*…so we get *ano na* substantial data or something like that (Oh, no, it's like answer this...so that we have something...something like...)

The use of the Tagalog enclitics *na, parang, pang,* and *yan* in English sentences makes the communication more efficient and faster because they contain condensed meaning, which when expressed in English would be longer, hence, unnecessary in discussion or conversation. Without the use of these words, the sentences would be longer.

Content Words

The use of content words which refer to cultural items may not be accurately translated into other languages; thus, its usage helps facilitate communication and makes it more efficient. Consider the following excerpt:

M: Dahil nga sa content na caffeine. Tsaka psychological na parang habit mo ng pagka umaga, saka nakakatulong sa ano, sa *moves*, sa *pagwi-withdraw* mo ng mga *waste products* mo, di ba? parang ganyan. Ayun, kaya kailangang gagawin mo na yun araw-araw, saka masarap naman. Meron din siyang lasa. (Because of the caffeine content. Also, it's kind of psychological that it has become a habit that every morning, and it helps in the bowel movement, right? That's why, you need to do it every day, besides, it tastes good. It also has its taste.)

It is interesting to note that in this portion of the interview, the interviewee would resort to using English to refer to situations or topics considered indecent or inappropriate in these kinds of conversations or contexts. The above exchange deals with the interviewee's toilet routine and how coffee helps in her regular bowel movement. Note, however, that she switched to use the English euphemisms and metaphors in describing her morning ritual. It is not only faster and easier to communicate these ideas, but it signals politeness and appropriacy on her part to do so.

M: Pagka mainit, dapat juice. Kapag may *patayan*, e di, dapat coffee. (If the weather is warm, juice. If there's a funeral wake, it should be coffee.)

The use of *patayan* (literally, killing) as used in this context refers to a funeral wake; its associations with coffee is cultural as Filipinos usually expect bereaved family members to serve coffee and biscuits to those who come to pay their last respects. This is to keep them awake as they accompany the bereaved members of the family.

M: Kasi nga pagka ano, para page-entertain ng bisita. It doesn't mean na, di kailangan na mainit o malamig. Di ba, kapag may dumating, entertainin mo. Parang, *offer them something to drink,* di ba? Yun, kaya basta may i-offer ka. Filipino hospitality, you know. Di ba, ganun? (It's because when like, for entertaining visitors. It doesn't mean, you don't need hot or warm. Isn't it that when somebody comes, you ought to entertain them? It's like offer them something to drink, right? That's it, as long as you have something to offer Filipino hospitality, you know. It's like that, right?)

Initially, M's sudden switch to English, *offer them something to drink*, cannot be explained or justified since its Tagalog counterpart, *Bigyan mo sila ng maiinom*, is equally fast and efficient to say. However, closer scrutiny of the clause would reveal that the Tagalog clause is longer; thus, less efficient than its English counterpart.

Table 3.

Patterns of use of English content words from the two sources of data

Categories Domains/Sources of data	Humanities/Psychology/ Sciences/Technology/ Mathematics	Business/Trade/Technical/ Vocational
School / Study group	survey form/questionnaire respondents questions defense mechanism repression/depression difference emotions sublimation/impulses data analysis findings 18, 16-25, 17	photocopy retype
Work / Interview	three kids, fifteen, twelve, magte-ten (turning ten) med tech graduate di ba addictive (isn't it…) syempre sa alcohol content yun eh may 10-12 per cent (of course, it has 10-12% alcohol content)	hindi masyado na-practice (did not fully practiced) ganoong business (that…) supplier ako ng Jollibee one eight and charge ko(I charge PhP1,800.) latex, quanatex (kinds of materials for balloons) meron po kayong compressor (do you have a compressor) kasi more on sa quality ako (because I go for more quality) maraming buyer (a lot of …)

Baker (2006) has posited that because bilinguals use different languages in different domains of their lives, it is expected that a person code-switches from the home language to the language used in school or work because technical terms in sciences, mathematics, and business may only be known in that language. Table 3 classifies the C-S occurrences using the two sources of data.

When asked why they code-switch in these instances, all participants attribute their switch to English because they need to express a concept that has no equivalent in Tagalog. Likewise, certain terms associated with school and work are easier, faster, and more efficient to express in English. The students particularly specified that using the Tagalog equivalents of some English terms would render it "baduy, mushy, and too parochial." Incidentally, their use of the term *baduy* has cultural nuances/connotations that go beyond being "old-fashioned, outdated".

Idioms

M: "Because I can drink it without limits."
M: "For sharing with friends."

Note once again the switch of the interviewee from Tagalog to metaphorical English sentences by associating a glass of juice to something without limits. The second sentence is in reference to wine and coffee.

In the study group discussion, there was no evidence of this function. It could be attributed to the fact that the topic of discussion does not lend itself very well to the use of idiomatic expressions due to the scientific nature/component of the topic.

Linguistic Play

Bautista (1999) proposes another reason for the use of C-S to achieve communicative efficiency through linguistic play. The interviewee resorts to a Tagalog word *nabobo* to be able to play with the word in reference to her inability to associate beer to the phrase, "to sober up."

M: "To sober up."
R: Ayan, beer, wine. (pause) Ah, para matanggal ng pagkalasing pala.
M: Coffee and tea. *Nabobo* yata ako sa 'sober.' Buti naman nabasa mo yan.

The use of *sya* by M and R in the sample below indicates a linguistic play to explain an observation. *Siya/Sya*, strictly speaking, is a third person singular which refers to people, not objects. However, her attempt to refer to a kind of beverage as a person may demonstrate a linguistic play emphasizing its animate characteristics.

M: Okay, yung beer po kasi, parang alcoholic drink *siya*, di ba?
R: Sa akin, oo, ganun din alcoholic drink din *siya*.
M: Pero nabanggit niyo *siya* sa listahan namin.

Conclusions and Pedagogical Implications

I have analyzed two forms of discussion using Hamers and Blanc's (2000) main types of C-S and Bautista's (1999) framework on the functions of C-S. The patterns of the participants' C-S in this study is in concurrence with Hamers and Blanc's findings that C-S occurs at the inter-sentential, extra-sentential, and intra-sentential levels or what others describe as a switch within the course of a single conversation at word or sentence level or at the level of blocks of discourse speech (Baker, 2006). The present study also validates the D'Souza three-item classification, particularly the Competence-*related CM* (where a person's competence in L2 is low and therefore has to go back to L1) and *Culture-related CM* (where a person uses terms and expressions in the language that cannot be expressed in another language).

Expanding Gumperz's (1982) framework, Bautista (1999) has posited that communicative efficiency is the force or purpose behind the functions of Tagalog-English code-switching. Four sets of evidence are presented to support this claim. Using excerpts from two sources of data – an audio-taped study group discussion of three female freshman college students, and a one-on-one interview/discussion between a 35-year-old businesswoman and a 43-year-old senior researcher from a private research company on the interviewee's buying and drinking practices, I identified and analyzed the various code switches made by the participants. These code-switching occurrences showed that the use of Tagalog enclitics like *pa, pang, para,* and *na* made their observations/explanations more efficient, easier, and faster. These enclitics enabled them to say or explain in fewer Tagalog words what might have taken them longer had they resorted to using English sentences. Also, the participants resorted to the use of Tagalog idioms to describe their perceptions more concretely, enabling them to express the essence of their perceptions towards certain brands of multivitamins. Identification of the content words used by the participants with regard to cultural nuances and function point to the observation that C-S occurs when words or phrases in two languages may not correspond exactly and they need to switch to another language to "express a concept that has no equivalent in the culture of the other language. Evident in the corpora is the switch to English whenever terms and concepts in science, mathematics, business, trade, and technology are used. This study reiterates what Bautista (1999) concluded:

> That the Filipino bilingual uses the language that provides the easiest, fastest, most effective, or most colorful way of saying something. The bilingual switches to the code that facilitates the best expression of the content he or she has in mind, and the switching can involve a word, a phrase, a pre-packed idiom or expression, a clause, a sentence… (p. 29).

What does this mean or imply as far as language teaching and learning is concerned, particularly in the Philippine contexts? It may be worth mentioning here that the Philippine Bilingual Education Policy (2006) dictates that one's heritage language must be used as

the medium of instruction starting in Grade 1. English becomes the medium of instruction for learning areas like English, Mathematics, Science, and Health starting in Grade 3. At the secondary level (high school), English is to be used as the primary medium of instruction in all public and private schools.

First, there is a need to recognize that people use language to communicate. In the Philippines where the bilingual education policy is in effect, teachers are strongly encouraged by the school administrators to discourage their students to switch languages at all times (e.g., English teachers must not allow students to speak or report in Tagalog or Filipino during English classes; likewise, Filipino teachers are not to allow their students to explain or report in English in their Filipino classes). However, given the reasons and the instances when a bilingual learner uses a language or switches codes, this policy inside the classroom must be reevaluated.

Second, there is a need to adapt a more liberal attitude towards C-S. Teachers who end up frustrated whenever their students switch codes must find consolation in the fact that their students (especially the beginners) are actually using (or grappling with) two distinct grammatical systems in expressing themselves; therefore, must not be looked down upon as being deficient in one or both languages.

Finally, there is a need to look at the role C-S plays in our classes. If lessons or concepts in mathematics, science, among other curricular subjects, can best be taught by teachers and learned by students in their mother tongue, why do we hesitate to use it vis-à-vis the prescribed language of instruction? Explaining a concept in one's language (or even in our own variety of English, e.g., Philippine English) to help our students understand is never degrading or indicative of one's deficiency in the use of the English language. The nuisances of the language and its lexicon drive us to switch codes to express a concept that has no equivalent in the culture of the other language. The use of C-S inside the classroom may even bring about a more engaging discussion among learners which may result in a deeper understanding of the lessons and a better performance of tasks.

References

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* (4th ed.). Sydney, Australia: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. & Hornberger, N. (Eds.). (2001). *An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bamiro, E. O. (2006). The politics of code-switching: English vs. Nigerian languages. *World Englishes*, *25*(1), 23–35.

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

Beardsmore, H. B. (1982). *Bilingualism: Basic Principles.* Avon, UK: Tieto.

Blom, A., & Gumperz, J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes. (Eds.). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 407-434). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

D'Souza, J. (1992). The relationship between code-mixing and the new varieties of English: Issues and implications. *World Englishes, 9*(2-3), 217-223.

Ferguson, C. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, *15*, 325–40.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The Sociology of language.* Rowley, M.A.: Newbury House.

Fishman, J. A. (1980). Bilingualism and biculturalism as individual and societal phenomena. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 1*, 3-15.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hamers, J. F., & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Meisel, J. M. (2004). The bilingual child. In C. Baker (Eds.). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.) (p. 109). Sydney, Australia: Multilingual Matters.

Myers-Scotton, C. M. (1990). Codeswitching and borrowing: Interpersonal and macrolevel meaning. In R. Jacobson. (Ed.). *Codeswitching as a worldwide phenomenon* (pp. 85-109). New York, USA: Peter Lang.

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

Sankoff, D., & Poplack, S. (1981). A formal grammar for code - switching. Paper in Linguistics, *14*(1): 3-45.

Scotton, C. M., & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: the social functions of code-switching. *Linguistics, 193*, 5–20.

Stroud, C. (2004). The performativity of code-switching. *International Journal for Bilingualism, 8*(2), 145-166.

Treffers-Daller, J. (1992). French-Dutch code-switching in Brussels: Social factors explaining its disappearance. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 13*(1&2), 143-156.

About the Authors

Eden Regala Flores is an associate professor of the Department of English and Applied Linguistics at De La Salle University, Manila. Her research interests include second language learning and teaching, instructional materials preparation, and (critical) discourse analysis.